

Alpin MacLaren's

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER

1997 - 2018

CONTENTS

| | |
|-------------------------------------|------------|
| The Case Against Feminism | 1 |
| Collected Articles 1997-2018 | 47 |
| Collected Emails 1997-2000 | 233 |
| Notes | 533 |

THE CASE AGAINST FEMINISM

INTRODUCTION

Why is there a need to create a case against feminism?

The primary reason that feminism requires debunking is that feminism is not about women. It is not for women. Feminism is about power for, and the political agenda of a small group of people, mostly women, who use women for their pawns, very much as Hitler used the German people to gain his personal goals. The mainstream media has been the willing accomplices in the feminist takeover of our society and therefore as guilty as the feminists themselves for the harm that has been done.

Feminism is based upon a lie. There is a significant difference between men and women and feminism tries to ignore or attack that difference. Books like "Men Are From Mars and Women Are From Venus" document the differences in even the method of thinking and communicating that men and women have. Other differences include the female's natural tendency to nurture that males just do not have. Children are in essential need of this nurturing, which feminism is intent on removing. Men are inherently more aggressive than women. These differences are real but feminism, because an admission of this reality would destroy their movement, refuses to see them. Since all of their claims are based upon a rejection of fact, feminism is destined to come to false conclusions. This has been clearly demonstrated over the thirty plus years that their philosophy has held sway in this country.

Feminism is a cruel religion. It is cruel to women. It places women into positions that women are not equipped to handle, and allows them to be abused, raped or murdered because of where they have gone. For example, the military is clearly an unsafe place for a woman, even in peacetime, but feminism is pushing as hard as it can to increase the numbers of women in this dangerous, and manly world. The results have already been unacceptably cruel, but the push is still on. The huge number of law suits by women who are harassed daily in the workplace, clearly demonstrate the inability of women to work along side men without ridged controls which were never required when men worked only with other men. Even with these controls in place, a woman is forever at risk. Feminists have no concern whatsoever for these women. Their only concern is for extending their power and furthering their philosophy.

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

Feminism is antagonistic to children in the extreme. Children get in the way of the feminist agenda. Whenever something gets in their way, feminists use the power of government to insure that the obstruction gets run over. The feminists are happiest when they can eliminate the problem of children early on, through abortion. If a baby is killed, it won't slow down a woman at work, and cannot possibly tie her down to a homemaker role. This makes feminists happy. If they fail in killing the children, they next attempt to push children into day-care centers, where mothers can avoid the time consuming task of actually raising the little nuisances. Feminism wants to rid women of any ties to children. This is devastating to the children, if not actually fatal.

Feminism is anti-man. Their "A woman needs a man, like a fish needs a bicycle," motto is clearly a declaration of war on the institution of marriage. Men have no role in the feminist world and are merely considered an obstacle to be overcome or removed. The role of husband is now filled only as a temporary position and that is the way feminism likes it. In fact, from the feminist point of view, it is a superfluous role that should be eliminated completely.

Feminism is not compatible with civilization. No civilization is possible without families. Families are where children learn civilized behavior. The weaker the families are, and the more temporary they are, the weaker and more likely to fail is the civilization. Feminism is a dagger aimed right at the heart of families. If that dagger is successfully placed, our civilization is over.

SECTION ONE - FEMINISM AND WOMEN

Chapter One - The Lie Which Destroyed Paradise

Eve was a housewife. She and her husband, Adam, lived in Paradise. It was not a perfect garden where all their needs were met without effort. Instead, it was a land where effort was rewarded, which is almost as good.

Adam went off to work each day and provided all the money that Eve and he needed to pay for food, housing, transportation, a few luxuries, and best of all, their children. Eve managed the affairs of the household, keeping it running like a well-oiled machine. The house was clean, the meals were wholesome, and the children were well-mannered, helping out with the household responsibilities.

THE CASE AGAINST FEMINISM

Though each day brought some problems and worries, Adam and Eve worked together to solve them.

The children respected Eve and were obedient to her because that is how they were taught to behave, and if they wanted to do otherwise at any time, they had Adam to face when he got home from work. Adam loved Eve and held her in the highest regard. He had her happiness as his highest goal. His sons were taught that a man always respected a woman and it is a man's responsibility to support his wife and children, giving them the best life he could. His daughters were taught that a wife's role was one of prime importance, and as mothers they would hold the future of the family, the neighborhood, and the society in their hands as they raised their children.

Into this Paradise there crawled a serpent. This scaly creature had been born of pride and greed. Bitter and jealous women looked at the happy situation that Adam and Eve shared and set out to destroy it. They sent the snake called Feminism to deceive Eve. One day Eve was surprised to find the snake in her living room, hanging from her chandelier.

"Do you think that you are happy?" asked the snake.

"Why, yes," she replied without hesitation. "I am very happy!"

"Ah, but look at the life you lead," hissed the snake. "Adam has it much better! He is the king of the castle. He gets all the praise for his professional work. This, while you are his maid, doing his laundry and nobody respects what you do!"

The trap had been sprung. The lie was out there. What did Eve do in response to the serpent's lie? And what have been the results?

Chapter Two - What Has Become of Adam and Eve's Paradise?

From Paradise, where men and women both held positions of honor and respect, children had a solid family in which to feel protected and safe, and the school of civilized behavior was always in session, where has our journey led us? As the generations have passed things have radically changed. The new generation's Eve lives a much different life than the old generation's did. Today Eve must scramble every morning to get ready for work, get the kids ready for school or day-care, fix breakfast and make sure everyone reaches their destinations before she heads to her job. As a single mother, she now has all of the responsibilities of her grandmother,

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

in taking care of the household, and also those of her grandfather in generating an income. She misses too many days of work because the kids need her attention, and so her relative pay is less than Adam's had been. She can only work long hours at the expense of her children, who need her supervision. Since she loves her children, her career is stunted by this fact. When Eve gets off from work, she must scramble once again, picking up the children from wherever she had been able to stash them for the day, and then driving them to any activities they may have. She must cook dinner, do the dishes and clean up the house. Her day is a mad jumble of responsibilities. Eve's children today do pretty much what they want because there is no Adam to teach them to respect and to mind their mother. She just doesn't have enough time in her day to teach them the manners that her grandmother taught her children. Paradise has been lost and all because Eve believed the lie of the serpent.

At the same time, people amazingly are so saturated with the feminist lie that they become angry by any effort to point out the fallacies that are inherent in it. It is a joke, or worse to suggest that, "A woman's place in the home." Yet that is the place that she has had for thousands of years! In ancient times, up to as late as the middle of this very century, we see the home as the place that a woman thrived and built society. Here is where she was cared for and was honored. Here is where her name and person were protected with all the might of her husband and sons. It is an identifying quality of our contemporary society that we think that we have found better answers to life's questions. The thousands of years of history are of no concern to the people of today. We constantly are trying to reinvent the wheel. Because of the high esteem given to "new ideas" today, the arrogance of the feminist has become her most prominent trait. She claims, without hesitation, that all women were nothing more than slaves and donkeys before she came along to uplift them into liberation. The names and intelligence of all the good hard-working women of the past are slighted by these pompous claims. Each of our female ancestors is insulted daily by the feminist pontificators. When you look around at the plight of women today, with all of the single mothers, women living below the poverty line with a flock of children to raise, women who have to duck bullets at night and dodge rapists by day, and a myriad of other plights that women must deal with, the question comes immediately

THE CASE AGAINST FEMINISM

to mind, “What in world did we ever listen to the feminists for?” Perhaps a more practical question should be, “When are we going to stop listening to them?” If we do not stop listening to the feminists, it will be impossible to undo the damage that they have done to women in this country. If we continue to give an ear to their unfounded, insane doctrines we will continue to deteriorate as a society and cease to be a great nation.

Chapter Three - Eve At Work

Following the Pied Piper from Paradise into the workplace, Eve put on her best dress and headed off in search of fulfillment. One of the things Eve was faced with, as soon as she started to work, was the masculine temperament. She found that men viewed her as a women before anything else. The fact that she was a coworker ran a very poor second in their minds. Men in groups would watch her as she walked by, commenting to each other about how good she looked, or how she would be in bed. If she wore a short skirt, she was eye-balled all day long. Guys were continually hitting on her for a date.

When Eve was put into a position of authority she found that it was a fact of life that men do not like to take orders from a woman. Men did not empathize with her monthly cycle, and if they mentioned it at all it was in a joking manner which attempted to cover up their disdain for her situation. Her company's sexual harassment policy caused men to speak to her one way face-to-face, but their true , and quite different, feelings were expressed when not in the company of female employees.

It is extremely important to note that these facts of the workplace are still going on, after over 30 years of brainwashing children in school with the feminist doctrine. These children have grown up and become adults and yet the facts of human nature have not changed in any significant way. Men have only modified their behavior as far as the law has forced them to, and women still are dressing in ways that inspire the sexist attitudes of men to continue. Women want to be sexually attractive and men want to think of them that way. Feminism has not changed that basic law of nature. Instead, what feminism has done is pull all of the social framework out from under our society and left chaos in its place. Instead of sexual attraction leading to a lifelong marriage and permanent family arrangement, we

have it leading to short-term serial marriages, short term sexual encounters, and sexual harassment suits at work. The power of this biological force has been steered from its productive riverbed of stable families into a new channel that is flooding the nation with instability.

Eve's grandmother was respected by her friends and family. She was in sync with her life around her. She had a feeling of belonging and wholesome purpose in life. She had a realistic goal of raising her children well, and running an efficient household. As we now leave Eve to struggle with her situation we can see that she is not in sync with her life. Her house is run in a haphazard, catch-as-catch-can manner. Her children are out of control. She has a dozen or more indicators presented to her each day that she does not belong in the workplace as much as a man does. She is keenly aware that she does not live in Paradise.

Chapter Four - What About All That Extra Money?

You often hear the passing comment, "You just need two incomes today." This is said to bring to a close the discussion, if it ever comes up, of a woman shouldering the difficult job of home-making as a full time career. "We might as well not even discuss it, because it is not even a possibility," is what the comment really means. It is a great discussion terminator but is it a fact?

Judging from my own personal experience, I have found it to be an out and out lie! Yes, you might have to give up some non-essentials like living in a big house or owning a few of the toys you would otherwise afford, but you get by. I have supported two sons in this fashion and my wife, who is a hard working home maker, has made our family's life a wonderful thing to behold. While renting instead of buying, often having to settle for apartments instead of houses, and driving used cars instead of new, we knew our kids were always supervised and that they were never going to be "home alone." They have both grown up into fine young men, the youngest leaving the nest this very year. There is no doubt that a mother at home is a giant plus for any child growing up. Taking that away from a child is not an option which a loving parent can choose.

What about the money? This is not the issue driving women out of the home. Most women burn almost all of their "extra" income on additional expenses created by the outside job. An extra car,

THE CASE AGAINST FEMINISM

working wardrobe, baby-sitters (whether they are called day-care, pre-school, or some other method of passing off the responsibilities of motherhood), added income taxes and extra costs for eating out more often. The mother is gone, and so is the money. When all is considered, a working mother is adding very little to the financial well being of her family, and that “second income” will be the most expensive money any family well ever earn!

Chapter Five - The Fragile Female

It is a story, told to all of our little girls, that they can do anything they want in life. They can do anything a man can do. But is it true? Do women really do what a man does?

Look at what has happened since women have been given access by the courts into new areas of work. As the women have come in, the work has changed to accommodate them. Suddenly, jobs that require heavy lifting are redefined. Why is this done, if women can do the same job as a man? Every job where the definition of the job was changed because women wanted the paycheck for doing the job, is an example of a job that women could not do. We pretend that women are doing that job now, because the PC courts insist that we must in order to keep our own jobs, but people know better.

How many times have you heard of a sexual harassment suit in the last ten years? For that matter, how many suits have you heard about in the last 10 months? It seems that a new one occurs every day. Each one of those legal actions represents a woman who could not take care of herself in the workplace. She is helpless and cries out to the court to take care of her. She is too fragile to be at work, but insists on being there anyway. Things like jokes, pictures on a wall or attentions paid her by men, are all too much for her to handle. In fact it is so overwhelming for her that she must be paid 6 or 8 figures by her ex-employer to compensate for the trauma of going into the workplace. (No one seems to notice that she often will attend movies where the same jokes, even more erotic photography and a date, far more aggressive than her coworkers, are somehow dealt with. How does she do it without resort to a large settlement out of court?)

In the decades prior to feminism's rise into totalitarian proportions, gentlemen did not tell dirty jokes in mixed company, and generally, ladies would be shocked if they tried. It was an era where

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

women were treated as fragile creatures, too delicate for men's courser natures. Today, the fragile female denies her delicate condition, demanding to be given the opportunity to show how tough she is. She can be a fighter pilot, astronaut or dock worker, just like any man. However, when given that chance, instead she demands that the workplace treat her just like the delicate lady that she is. No dirty jokes, no advances by men, and no heavy lifting.

Companies are put into a no-win situation. They must hire women employees because the liberal courts will award money to the turned down lady if they do not. Once they do hire her, she is a walking law-suit ready to happen. She is a china doll, in a room full of bulls. Sooner or later, the company may have to pay damages because the delicate flower had a pedal creased by the facts of life at work. She then has the hypocritical gall to act like she was the offended party.

The fact that Damages are awarded and working conditions are routinely modified to accommodate the lesser toughness of women, completely justifies the opinion held by all previous generations of men and women, that women should be at home, and be protected by her husband and family. Instead of this sound, reasonable opinion, based upon thousands and thousands of years of history, we have the world of today where all must pretend that the emperor is wearing clothes. "Women are the same as men. This is a fact, and" say the thought police, "You will believe this fact, or else you will be fired, fined and ostracized!" That is not freedom. It is not even rational. It is a lie upon which we can never build, or even maintain, a strong and healthy society.

Women are too fragile to take care of themselves in a man's world. Even with all of the liberal legal abuses generated in support of women (each a screaming declaration of the delicacy of our females), ladies are still harassed, abused and raped at an ever increasing rate. Our society has taken women out from under the loving care of their fathers in their youth, and their husbands in their adult years. At the same time we are rapidly destroying the social customs that provided protection for women of past generations. Now, we leave it to the overburdened court system to supply the protection for our delicate women. It is not working. TAP. TAP. TAP. IS THIS MICROPHONE ON? IT IS NOT WORKING!!!!

THE CASE AGAINST FEMINISM

Chapter Six - Woman = Man?

When the subject of equality comes up, the feminists are quick to point out that a woman can do any job a man can do. Followed closely behind this is the demand for equal pay for equal work, and a rash of temper tantrums and hysterical weeping over the "fact" that women make less money than men. Judging from this bouquet of hostility one would think that women are exact replicas of men and for some strange, inexplicable reason, men have chosen, using some unknown outside force, to subjugate women to a lesser position. Of course, with the two sexes being carbon copies of each other, with no differences, this could never have happened through simple domination of the stronger over the weaker. Feminists are obsessed with convincing everyone who will listen to their "wisdom," that women are not the weaker sex. Therefore, we are at a loss to understand as to how women ever came to be in a secondary status, as is claimed to be the case.

Let us assume total equality between the sexes. Now this should mean that, with absolutely no differences between the sexes, we should just open the door to women applicants for all jobs and suddenly one half, or slightly more, of the jobs will be filled by females based upon their equal abilities. Let us test our hypothesis. We should now have women staring in the National Basketball Association, or at least half of the starting positions should be filled by women. How many women play in the equal opportunity field of the National Basketball Association? Zero! What? How can this be? There are no differences between the sexes but no women can qualify to play in the NBA. Perhaps this is just a errant data point. Even though the NBA allows players of all races and from all over the world to qualify to play, perhaps they are prejudiced only against women. That must be why the WNBA was created. Let's try again.

We will next find the percentage of starting female players in Major League Baseball. Here is a sport that prides itself in breaking the color line and allowing no prejudice to block all qualified players from getting their shot. Half of the starting rosters for baseball must be women. Let's check. Zero women starting players. Hmmm. Even sitting on the bench, reserved for the second string scrub players, there are zero women. Our hypothesis is not faring too well. We check the NFL and we find that there are no women in pro football. I am not sure but I think I see a pattern developing here. How about

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

tennis? We find that women only play against each other in tennis singles matches.

Ahhh! But wait, here we have something to back up our feminist claim: mixed doubles. Why we should call it that, when all men and women are the same is a little puzzling but let us examine it none the less. Watching a mixed doubles match is quite interesting. We see the men players hitting the ball at the opposing female players and even the females players are hitting the ball to the opposing females whenever they can. Fascinating. What can this mean? Obviously tennis players think that the female opponent is the weaker opponent and are trying to take advantage of that by hitting to the woman across the net. Well that doesn't help our hypothesis out now does it?

Imagine the newspaper headline: Steffi Graf Defeats Andre Agassi For World Title. Can you imagine how much delight the feminists and liberal newspapers would enjoy that fantasy coming true? Back in the 1970's it was a big media event when Bobby Riggs challenged the world's best female tennis players to singles matches. Billie Jean King who was number one declined to play him but Margaret Court, who was number two, accepted. Bobby Riggs easily won that match. Why did this make news? Because Bobby Riggs was nearly sixty, a very old man for professional sports. Finally Billie Jean accepted and defeated Bobby Riggs (which is the only thing that is ever mentioned today, when the subject comes up) but the fact remains that he beat the number two woman in the world.

The real world of sports, even the Olympics, are completely segregated by sex. Though women have been given chances to try out in professional sports but they have never qualified as good enough. Even the freak of nature, female super-achiever, is not good enough for men's professional sports. Female sports are, like the Special Olympics, for lesser athletes. The female sports that have a long standing of support are ones that show off the female form exceptionally well. The fit and trim girls running around in their mini-skirted tennis outfits, playing peek-a-boo with every serve, and any breeze that comes along, has a large following. The ice-skaters, with their steamy outfits are also very popular. Promoters of female professional football learned that covering up the female body is death to fan support because the actual play is far inferior to that of the men.

THE CASE AGAINST FEMINISM

The baseball Silver Bullets, dressed in the typical men's baseball uniform, have an excellent professional manager, and draw on the very best female talent in the country for their team players, and yet they have an abysmal won-loss record, while playing games only with second rate pickup teams of men players. If they hope do more than merely survive, living off the grace of their dedicated sponsor and the fanatical feminists, and instead actually grow into a full fledged female sport, they must learn the lesson of other successful women's sports, and show off what they have that is entertaining. (The fledgling WNBA should also take note and design their uniforms accordingly.)

Obviously the hypothesis of total equality is faulty. As with all faulty hypotheses, when they are proven wrong, they must be thrown out. Women and men are different and are not carbon copies of each other.

The only logical conclusion is that women are not capable of doing certain things, as demonstrated by their poor showing in the sports world. So, to test where their abilities actually lie, let us set up standards that are the minimum requirement for a job and test all applicants to see if they can qualify. If they can, then of course they will be hired. If not then they will not be hired. This should make the feminists, who believe in total equality, quell their hostility. All should be pleased with this solution.

When we look around, we find many jobs where standards have been the norm for decades. Historically, the military, firemen and policeman have had to meet standards. What has been the feminist response to this equal opportunity to qualify in these areas? Are they overjoyed at the chance to prove their theories through actual testing against these standards? No! Instead, they have used the courts to force the standards to be lowered! This must give us pause. The NBA is allowed to maintain its standards, even though it is a totally unimportant part of our society. If standards were to be forced lower, one would think something as unimportant as a sporting event would be the place to start. The military guards our entire country from enemies who might attack us. If the military is weakened it will ultimately harm us all. The firemen are the ones upon whom we depend, in case of fire, to pull us out of harms way, even if we weigh two hundred pounds or more. If they are weakened it will put our lives in danger. The policemen have to fight the bad guys, often

physically taking them on, one on one. This is critical to maintaining law and order in our communities. Certainly lowering the standards here is illogical at best.

It is quickly seen why feminists are so hostile. They believe in a mythical equality of the sexes and act accordingly. They are frustrated by reality, which runs counter to their beliefs. This breeds a confusion which results in angry name calling and application to the courts to straighten reality out. It is quite insane, but it has caught on in the United States today. Quite fashionable really.

Even when women can physically handle a physically non-demanding job, they miss more working days than men, for various reasons, but mostly because of children. Missing more work than a man, is not doing the same job as a man. So, it is not surprising that their pay is not the same. More frustration for the feminists. To really throw salt in the wounds of these poor deluded ladies, many women will quit their job for varying lengths of time because they get married or children are born. Since this will usually kill any serious, power career, the feminists are appalled. This is just not to be taken sitting down by these fanatics. It is time for action! But they have found, over and over again that no action is possible that will eliminate the differences between men and women. Yet they keep trying!

Chapter Seven - The Old Ball Game

Let's take a little trip into the future and listen to a conversation between a grandfather and his grandson.

"Joey, you know when I was a kid baseball wasn't like it is today," said Gramps to his 15 year old grandson. The three-dimensional presentation of the game was being played out on their living room floor, and had the same perspective for them as if they were in the stadium themselves.

"Yeah," replied Joey. "You had to watch it on that little 2-D TV screen, didn't you?" The crowd roared as the fifth batter in the line up led-off the inning with a walk.

"TV wasn't what I was referring to boy," Gramps said with a shake of his head. "TV was pretty primitive in those days to be sure, but the game was a whole lot better!"

THE CASE AGAINST FEMINISM

The smell of popcorn and hot dogs was all around them as the runner took a short lead off first. Some fan was yelling support for the home team and a baby could be heard off in the distance.

"Oh, sure it was Gramps!" laughed Joey. "Everything was better in the 'good old days.' We all know that!"

The pitcher didn't bother making a throw over to first and concentrated on the next batter. The bottom half of the order never stole a base and he couldn't afford another walk.

"Ha, ha," laughed Gramps without any mirth. "Back then there were 9 men on a team. All 9 of them could play ball, and most of them could hit too!"

"Even the girls?" asked Joey in disbelief. The next batter took a called fourth strike. Only one more and the pitcher would be done with this batter.

"There were no girls on the team then, that is what I am trying to tell you Joey," said Gramps. "They had 9 men on the team and no women."

"Why that is pure sexism Gramps! Everybody knows you got to have women on the team, its the law!" Joey couldn't believe what he was hearing. The courts had ruled before he was born that all sports teams had to have a compliment of female players that was at least equal in relative size to the percentage of females in the population. That meant, since there were slightly more women than men in America, the baseball teams had to have five women on the field at all times. This was just common sense.

"It wasn't the law back then!" replied Gramps with enthusiasm. "Back then you could get the best players you could afford to pay for to play on your team. Everybody played by the same rules too." Today, the fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth and ninth batter were women. They were allowed 5 strikes before they were out, and 2 balls gave them a walk. Men were out after 3 strikes and it took 4 balls to walk them.

The batter took a swing at the next pitch and missed. No one seemed surprised, since the fifth through ninth batter nearly always made an out. There were rumors that the court was going to change the rules again and insist that only women could pitch to women to make the game more fair. They also were reviewing the practice of putting all the worst batters at the end of the lineup, since that was obviously a sexist approach.

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

"Wow Gramps," Joey said shaking his head. "Things were sure sexist when you were a kid weren't they?"

"Yes I guess they were Joey. I guess they were." Gramps looked at the game in progress and got up. He hadn't really enjoyed a baseball game in years. Joey liked the home team and Gramps like to do things with him, but baseball just wasn't baseball anymore. As he went to get a soda pop from the kitchen, he wondered how things had ever come to be where they were now. Was sexism really such a bad thing?

Chapter Eight - Feminism and the Date

Date rape is currently a hot topic of television talk shows, magazine articles and newspaper stories. It a major issue with feminists and a concern of all parents of girls. What is it about today's society that makes date rape such a common occurrence?

The grandparents of our modern day woman approached dating in a completely different way. Dating had one purpose: to find a lifetime partner for marriage. Fun activities were the rule but they were chaperoned and/or in public places. Sex was saved for marriage and most women were virgins prior to their wedding nights. It was a very common occurrence that a woman would never have any other sexual partner for her entire life than her husband. Girls that did have sex with men on dates were looked down on and considered "loose" and not "the type of girl a man would want to marry."

Parents were much different then also. A man who got a girl pregnant was expected to marry the girl and stay with her for life. A girl's father, brothers, uncles and cousins were all there to protect her. She was looked upon as needing protection and therefore got it. When grandma went on a date, because of the pre-feminist customs in force then, she was relatively safe from date rape because boys were first of all taught that it was wrong by their stay-at-home mothers and secondly, because they knew that a girl's family would physically harm or kill them if they tried such a barbaric thing. Because of the training and social pressures, Grandma was unlikely to become a single mother from dating also. A perfect system? No. There were some problems with it, and a small number of women did end up in unhappy marriages, being raped on a date or as unwed mothers. But the number of girls that this happened to was insignifi-

THE CASE AGAINST FEMINISM

cantly small when compared with the number of such events occurring today.

Today the whole dating package has changed. It has a new purpose. Today, a date is nothing but a chance to go out and have fun, with no eye towards marriage. Men no longer look at their date as an angelic creature whom they may want to share their lives with. Drinking, drugs and sex are often included in a date. What protection does the woman of today have? Her parents assume that all teenagers and young adults are a bunch of animals that cannot help having sex before they are married. Many parents go so far as to allow their daughter to live in their house with her boyfriend. So, if sexual intercourse happens, it was to be expected. Therefore, it happens very frequently. Seldom does a father of today, even if he is still living in the same home as his daughter, contemplate taking a gun and finding the boy that deflowered his little girl, even if it was forced upon her.

A guy goes on a date expecting to have sex and is disappointed if he does not "get any." Girls dress for dates in outfits that would have made a whore blush in grandma's time. Dates are often to out of the way places where there is no protection at all for the girl. Feminism has taught the kids that women are free to have all the sex that they want, with whomever they want. All the societal protection, short of criminal prosecution, has been removed which prevented a male from raping his female date. Since women are having sex before marriage, that special something called virginity, is not taken when a rape occurs and it has led to a lessening of the significance of the act of rape. Feminists constantly cry out against rape, but their philosophy has made it far more likely that a rape will occur.

The act of sex has been cheapened by the feminist. Feminism views sexual intercourse as a badge of freedom for women, even though it all too often later makes a marriage more difficult to sustain, and single motherhood a virtual certainty if practiced often enough. Contrary to bringing freedom, there is nothing that can shackle a woman's life like being a single mother. Thanks to feminism, women's lives have become one of slavery to circumstance.

Chapter Nine - Are Women Sex Objects?

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

There can only be one honest answer to this question. Men's magazines would go broke, 1-900 numbers wouldn't exist, Madison Avenue would not pour big dollars into model's fees, and men would not stop whatever they are doing to watch a woman walk by if they were not. Face it, prostitution would never be the oldest profession unless women were sex objects. All across the nation we see billboards, and mud flaps showing off the female body. Why? Because this curvaceous form has a predictable effect on males. It is not just a conscious reaction! The pupils of the male eye will actually change state when seeing a picture of a woman's body. Commercial advertising of all types take advantage of this by using these sex objects, trying to associate the mental image of bedding a beautiful babe with their product. Television shows and movies put as many naked, or near naked, women into their shows as they can. Men just can't get enough of those sex objects.

Contrary to the feminist drivel, women want to be sex objects as well! Why are high-heels popular with women? It is not because women are afraid of being vertically challenged. It is not because the heels are comfortable to wear. It is because it makes the calf muscles stand out which enhances the sexual appeal of their bodies. Why do women wear short skirts? These lovely ladies have to fight all day to make sure their knees are together to avoid publicly parading their underwear, while repeatedly checking the hem to make sure it hasn't pulled up embarrassingly and they have to be very careful when they bend over to pick something up for the same reason. What is the point of going through all of that hassle? Obviously it is to make men think of them as sex objects. What of tight pants, low-cut blouses, see-through materials, and makeup? How about shorts, thin shirts which reveal the shape of their mammary papilla in clear highlight, and peek-a-boo slits up their long skirts? All of it highlights the sexuality of the woman, enhancing her image as a sex-object.

At one level or another you already know this. It wouldn't even be worth mentioning except for the fact that it is completely contrary to the feminist dogma of today. We are told that women are not sex objects and the they don't want to be thought of as sex objects. These two key tenets of the feminist commandments, proclaimed to be straight from the feminist goddess of policy, are clearly made of the same fertilizer as the rest of the "ideas" in this false religion.

THE CASE AGAINST FEMINISM

They are out and out lies. Being a sex object is one aspect of every woman. The degree to which she wishes herself to be thought of in that manner will be shown in her attire and the way she walks, talks and flirts. But it is one of the things that is always evaluated about her by everyone she meets during the day. This simple fact seems to be a taboo subject, in spite of its obvious truth.

Many feminists have aggressively tried to fight against this basic law of nature. Some dress in manly, or unkempt clothes to try and hide the fact that they are sex objects. But the general population of women are quite comfortable with the facts of life. Being sexually desirable is something that most women are proud of, or else they would not dress in a fashion to highlight that side of their being. The unnatural aspect of this issue comes into the picture when the feminist, head buried firmly in the sand, proclaims that all of this sex appeal doesn't exist, or can be changed.

In this section we have seen that feminism is truly cruel to women. It has put the burden of supporting themselves upon the mothers of our nation. With the changes that it has created within our society, it has increased the chances to a very high level that a woman will be abused, raped or murdered sometime in her life. Dates are often a place of rape or consensual sex where an unplanned child is produced. The system of protection for women has been removed by feminism and women are suffering every day because of it.

SECTION TWO - FEMINISM AND MEN

Chapter One - The Tiger is Unleashed

Men are bigger, stronger and more sexually driven than women are. They can overpower a woman, and do not need a weapon to be a serious threat to her. These are biological facts of life. The feminist philosophy attempts to minimize or ignore the significance of these facts and that is why it is such a destructive point of view.

Boys can be raised to think of women as special creatures who are to be treated differently than men. With this upbringing in place, a man will naturally protect a woman in danger. He will do symbolic things, showing that protective attitude, like opening her door for her. He will be willing to be a lifetime partner in marriage with her. He will have it ingrained in his deepest ego recesses that he is responsible for taking care of his wife, and being helpful to, and pro-

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

tective of, women in general. He is not a threat to commit a rape, or leave his wife for another woman. Although there are exceptions, these generalities usually hold true.

On the other hand, men can be raised to think of women as nothing special. Women are able to take care of themselves, even defend themselves, and certainly support themselves. There are no real controls on the sexual drives of these men, because they have been taught that a woman is not a potential wife but rather a sexual conquest waiting to be made. A rape is far more likely to be caused by one of these men. If they enter into a relationship, they have no deep seeded need to be the provider for their family, because a woman has her own income. When a better looking (more understanding, more sexually active...) woman comes along, he goes along with her, with hardly a brush of conscience. Such men are tigers on the prowl, looking for new prey to satisfy their sexual desires. Women can never rely on them for support if a child is produced by their sexual activities. This has been clearly demonstrated by the young adults of today.

Feminism, as it has taken root in our country, has changed men's upbringing from the former to the later of the above scenarios. Men have lost their status as the head of the family, provider and protector. Women have taken over these roles to an ever increasing degree. This has left men free to wander off and do what they want to do, while leaving the family to fend for itself. Boys are raised in homes with no father and have no role model of how to be an integral part of a family. They also are relatively free of discipline from their single mothers and therefore do not learn the civilized behavior that boys once were taught. Gangs of boys are becoming more and more prevalent, where the group is the surrogate replacement for the fathers that are not around for their sons.

Gangs are run by males, for males. To a gang member, women are nothing but pieces of meat to be used for men's pleasure. Gangs are not part of our civilization, they are at war with it. They feed off the misery of others by selling drugs and women, and use violence to protect their devastated territory. As gangs grow more numerous, our civilization is severely threatened. Gangs would be non-existent if fathers had a non-feminist upbringing, and a solid role in the family. Instead the size of the gang population is increasing, and

THE CASE AGAINST FEMINISM

children all over the country are wearing gang-type attire, and listening to the gangs' rap music.

Chapter Two - What Marriage Means to a Man

Physically, married men live longer than single men do. It would appear that marriage supplies some key ingredient to the mix that is life, which men need. The magical creature called "woman" complements his hardness with her softness. She fills his need to be a man at a basic level, and his longevity is at stake if he does not have that need met.

A man needs to feel important. He needs to feel that he is honored. The male ego is a mystery to women. Yet, there is nothing on earth that can boost the male ego more than the emotional support of a woman. A man is his strongest when he perceives the need of his strength by his woman. The contrast of his masculinity with her femininity can drive him to reach levels of ethical strength, career advancement, and physical endurance that nothing else can. When he perceives need in his wife, a man will move mountains, if necessary, to fill it.

Feminists have aimed their strongest attacks at this mechanism. They have denied a woman's need of a man's strength, thereby removing a man's motivation to be strong for his wife. They have attempted, with unfortunate success, to goad women into careers whereby the man's role has been lessened, and to appear increasingly insignificant. They have denied the distinct differences between the masculine and the feminine, creating confusion, and removing much of the driving force from all modern marriages.

This process has been carried on for three decades and a steady increase in the divorce rate has been the result. Men and women are waiting longer and longer before getting married but the increased problems brought on by this wait, including numerous sexual encounters, broken relationships and illegitimate children, make it even more likely that their marriages will end in divorce.

Men need a life long marriage at least as much as women do. They need to feel the importance of being responsible for a family. They need to be needed, loved and to feel they are in an honored position. By their efforts, feminists are destroying men by stealing their families from them. There is no lower activity on the face of the earth.

Chapter Three - The Key to Civilization

Men hold the power in this society, as they have in all societies that have ever existed. This will never change because, contrary to the feminist propaganda, it is a law of biological fact that men are more aggressive than women. The only reason that feminism has had any serious impact upon our country is because many men have foolishly supported the movement. Even today, men do the heavy work, the fighting, and the leading in nearly all areas of our society.

Men are extremely competitive and many women are at a loss to understand why men are often very upset by a poor performance in something so seemingly insignificant as a sporting event. They explain it away as a “guy thing.” This “guy thing” is what pushes men in business and politics. It is why men will always be the dominate sex in the leadership of any human civilization.

Women are less competitive by nature. They are more nurturing. Men expect their children to mind the first time that they are told to do something. Mothers are far more pliable than fathers, tending to give in to a child's pleading. Men do not understand this aspect of women, and view it as “a girl thing.” Children need both of these parental approaches and that is why a single mother or father is not as effective as a parent as would be a married couple.

The nurturing woman has a vital role in any civilization. She not only is able to fill the role of “mother,” far better than a man, but she also has an influence upon a man that nothing else can. The naturally wilder, uncivilized man is pulled back, held in check by his woman. Anyone who has walked across a dark parking lot in the late evening, is brought a feeling of relief when they see that the big, mean-looking man who just got out of a car nearby is accompanied by his wife. Why is that?

Women civilize men. A man is less aggressive, less prone to criminal activity, and less likely to prowl around with a group of other men looking for trouble when he is in a permanent relationship with a woman. Men even drive cars more carefully, and worry more about the results of all their actions, when they have a wife and children depending on them.

By inducing women to not depend upon men, and thereby virtually eliminating the permanent marriage from our society, the feminist philosophy has removed the civilizing check upon men. How often have you heard the phrase from a woman's mouth, “Men are

THE CASE AGAINST FEMINISM

animals,” or how about, “Men are pigs?” Without a woman and a solid marriage to keep them in line, that is exactly what men tend to be. As marriages become more fragile, men become less civilized.

Civilization is the only thing which protects a woman in this world. When civilization breaks down, as ours is beginning to, women find that their situation becomes less and less secure. Rape becomes more common. Women are viewed as mere conquests or possessions by the uncivilized man.

What of religion? Will that save the feminist female as society crumbles about her? Will the Christian beliefs force men into civilized behavior? Absolutely not! The Christian Bible is the most patriarchal document in common usage today. From start to finish the Bible commands women to be submissive to their husbands and it is loaded with examples of women who were just that. Old Testament and New are complete and devastating attacks upon the feminist philosophy. The more society accepts feminism, the more it must reject biblical Christianity. There is no hope of help from that quarter.

There is nothing but hopelessness for the followers of the feminist and any society which embraces her doctrine. Families disintegrate, men become more and more uncivilized, women are in increasing danger and civilization crumbles. It is as sure as the sunrise.

Chapter Four - Real Men: The Need for Masculinity

As our society has become more progressive, we have made every effort to eliminate the masculine from the picture. Real men are becoming harder to find, as the Political Correctness movement has launched an all out effort against them.

What are the qualities of a real man that the feminists hate so much? Here are a few of them:

- A real man does not do housework because it is women's work. Sure, when the wife is ill or an emergency comes up, a real man will lend a hand but generally a real man has a real woman to do his housework for them both.
- A real man supports his family. His wife does not earn a paycheck, but she spends most of his! His family is financially supported by his efforts. He will do whatever it takes to keep a

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

roof over the heads of his family and ensure that they have plenty to eat.

- A real man does not leave his wife for another woman, ever! He is true to his marriage vows and will do whatever it takes to hold his marriage together. He will treasure his wife and treat her like the special creature that she is. His world is his wife and family.
- A real man is a solid father. He teaches his children manners, and ethics. His children are taught to mind and be concerned about other people's feelings and property. You want his children to be the kids next door to your house.
- A real man is the king of his house. He has the final word on major decisions. He is very concerned about the happiness of all of the members of his house and does not make decisions that will emotionally harm any of them. His decisions are based upon the all of the needs of his family: emotional; moral; and financial. His reign is kind and merciful. The subjects of his rule are proud of their position, and not embittered by their role.
- A real man is a gentleman. He is not rude, or thoughtless of others. He is firm but not hostile. He is honorable and honest. If you break down on the road, you want a real man to stop and help you. If your daughter is getting married, you know that she will have a secure, honorable and happy life if she marries a real man. Your grandchildren will be well mannered and happy if their father is a real man.

Yes, this is the individual that the feminists hate. Here is the focus of all their hostility. They have done everything in their power to train boys in school, and anywhere else they have influence, that being a real man is evil and to be avoided. Instead boys are directed towards being effeminate. Feminists want men who cry and are sensitive, who are willing to let a woman run things. If they had their way all little boys would be dressed in skirts and little girls would wear the blue jeans.

It will never happen exactly that way, because it is biologically programmed into males to be masculine and into females to be feminine. However, what feminism has been able to do is destroy the training that boys used to receive, and instead of real men, they are becoming real animals, chasing sexual encounters and more toys, instead of the things that create a stable society and long term families.

THE CASE AGAINST FEMINISM

What we are in dire need of in this country are more real men, and the real women who will join with them to create a solid society!

SECTION THREE - FEMINISM AND CHILDREN

Chapter One - A Woman's Right To Choose

Does a woman have a right to choose? Of course. She can choose what to eat each day. This is a choice and she has a right to make a decision as to what that choice is to be. No individual that I know of opposes this right. Therefore, it appears to be without opposition that a woman has a right to choose. The title phrase of course is too ambiguous to have any meaning worth getting into large scale debates over. It is an incomplete statement, in that it has no object or qualification as to what she might be choosing.

If the title of the article were rephrased thusly, "A woman's right to choose to do anything at all she desires," then the assertion is patently false. A woman may not legally rob, assault or extort. This is not contested by even the most radical feminist to my knowledge. Once again we are left without anything to discuss.

So far we have established that a woman has a legal right to choose certain things, but not all things. So, what is the limiting factor in her right to choose? When her choice will harm another person, physically, financially and sometimes emotionally, the law stops her from doing so.

Let us take an example. A woman delivers a baby after eight months of pregnancy. She is unmarried, young, and without financial support. She decides that she doesn't want this baby in her life. She wishes that it had never existed because of the problems that it brings along with its presence. She reasons that this child will grow up unloved and despised. No child should have to go through that. It might be molested by a boyfriend of hers or end up on drugs or in a gang. She decides that the only humane thing to do is to terminate the life of the child. She takes out a large kitchen cutting utensil and proceeds to separate her child into smaller pieces for ease of disposal. She has exercised her ability to choose but not her right to choose. She has no legal right to kill her child. In fact she is guilty of murder, and can be prosecuted for that crime. The newspapers, child rights advocates and other like minded groups join their voices

together with the religious right, and like minded groups in outrage that such an atrocity has occurred. Liberal talk show hosts, join their voices together with the conservative talk show hosts in denouncing this woman's actions. All agree that this is an outrage.

Now, take a second example. A woman, also very young, has carried a fetus for eight months. It has developed to the exact same point as the child in the first example. This woman decides that for the same reasons as those listed in the first example, she is going to hire a doctor to do exactly the same thing to her child as the mother did in the first example. The doctor lays her on a table, and proceeds to segment the body parts of the baby into separate pieces for easy extraction. The child dies a rather unpleasant death. Suddenly the reactions of the general population is no longer uniform. Now we have the country divided into two hostile camps. Now the liberal and the conservative disagree about the morality and ethical nature of the act. The conservative reaction is consistent. He is outraged by the brutal murder of a baby. The liberal suddenly sees no problem with the act.

Here we have a clear demarcation between the anti-abortionists and the pro-abortionists. Consistency would dictate that if one of the above acts is a crime, so is the other. It takes a mental effort of huge proportions to see any significant difference between the results of the two acts in the two examples. In both cases a child dies. In both cases a mother is freed from the responsibilities of mothering a child. In both cases the child will not grow up in a neglected environment. In both cases the child was equally well developed physically and mentally. The only difference is not significant to the child, it either has or has not moved a few inches outside the wall of mother's abdomen. The two children are of equal intrinsic value and are an equal loss to humanity.

Does a woman have a right to choose to end the life of her baby? If people believe this, then they are hypocritical if outraged by mothers who drown, smother, or neglect their children to death, because it is a woman's right to choose what is done with her baby's life. They have no grounds for outrage about a woman exercising her right to choose.

Chapter Two - The Ghosts of the Children

THE CASE AGAINST FEMINISM

How many lives has feminism taken? It is the bloodiest movement this planet has ever seen. Hitler, and his Second World War, complete with gas chambers and death camps, could not reach the body count of feminism. Stalin with his millions of executions could not match the slaughter of the women's movement. The death toll is staggering and growing at a steady rate of more than a million per year,. More than the number of all the soldiers America has lost, in all of its wars combined, is the number of little children that are put to death in the United States of America each year in the unholy sacrament of the feminist religion.

Abortion is the greatest unnatural cause of death the world has ever seen. Babies are dissected alive, burned to death in the womb, pulled part way out of the womb and then stabbed in the brain and in some cases delivered completely and then thrown into a bucket of water and drowned. This, all in the name of the feminists' twisted claim to a "Woman's right to choose."

We will not discuss the ethics of abortion here. It would be like discussing the ethics of child rape, or the kidnapping, torture, and murder of an innocent woman or any activity devoid of even a touch of ethics. How can you discuss that which does not and cannot exist? Instead, let us look at the motives and results of this lethal activity.

Any murder must have a motive, either sane or insane. What is the motive for the murder of over 30 million of our little children? Feminists know that women can never be free to have casual sex without a possibility of a pregnancy occurring. Feminists view men as being superior because they can have sex without having to worry about the consequences. In order for women to be as good as men, in feminists' eyes, abortion must be legal. Feminists have also killed the children because they view them as the biggest obstacle to their unnatural goals.

In the US, we peaked at killing 1.5 million babies a year, and now have fallen off to killing "only" a couple of hundred thousand more than a million babies per annum. We have over 30 million less citizens in our country today because they never had a chance to be born. (That is more people than live in our most populous state, or the entire country of Canada!) But even that drastic and heartless solution was not enough. Many babies actually survived these Herodical measures. Now what to do? Back to the courts. Let us

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

make employers and/or the government foot the bill for the differences (a non-sequitur?) between men and women. We will force them to pay for day care, and then pretend that the births never actually happened. It's almost as good as killing the kids, because women do not have to waste any time with the little nuisances, with their runny noses, during the work day. This special treatment, we can pretend is equality.

No one wants to see a woman die on the end of a clothes hanger. It is a horrible tragedy! But the same part of your heart that is touched by her death is touched by her little child that died right along with her. All of the arguments put forth by the feminists in support of this ongoing atrocity are nothing but houses of cards that are blown over with the first breath of logic that happens along. Feminists are not concerned with having logical arguments! All of the arguments that they use are only put up as a distracting smoke screen anyway, to avoid talking about the fact that they are killing children. The real motivation for abortion is sexual freedom for women and nothing else!

Feminists know that child rearing is a full-time occupation for a woman, but single mothers have been a natural result of feminism. Single motherhood disrupts a woman's life, makes it nearly impossible to compete with a man in a career, and shows up feminism to be the lie that it actually is. To counteract this, abortion has been pushed harder, and more militantly, than any other feminist goal. This is not a women's issue: Over half of the children slaughtered have been female!

Abortion shows feminism with its true colors flying. This movement is as heartless as the Nazis and even more bloodthirsty. It was the darkest day in American history when this country turned an open ear to these people. We shall be haunted for many long years by the ghosts of our murdered children.

Chapter Three - A Mother's Love

Throughout history there has been a constant that has been passed down from generation to generation. This constant has been praised in poetry and in song. It has been the subject of drama and of comedy in the theater. This constant has been known to nearly all of the people who have ever lived and is known as "a mother's love."

THE CASE AGAINST FEMINISM

Little boys and little girls have threatened each other with, "I'm going to tell my Mommy!" for as long as there have been children. When a child is faced with a situation that is too big for his little abilities to handle he cries, "I want my Mommy!"

Through daily childish problems, and confusion about right and wrong, children have always known that they can drop everything, right now, and run into the loving arms of their mother for an answer. Until today.

Feminism has put a stop to all that nonsense. If a child today has a problem, he must approach a busy day care operator and wait in line, or wait for her television show to reach a good stopping point before he will have his problem curtly dealt with. Today, Mommy is entirely too busy trying to earn a paycheck to be bothered with sharing her mother's love with her child. Is she cold-hearted? No! She has been duped by the feminist propaganda machine into thinking that a job is more important than her children.

Children are sent to daycare, pre-school, baby-sitters or just left home alone by mothers who are convinced that they are doing the right thing. The feminist has waged a full scale attack on mothers for several decades. At first, when the courts and popular opinion were dead set against them, they lied to the American people by saying that all they wanted was for women to have an opportunity to work. Women who wanted a career could already have one, long before the 1960's. It wasn't fashionable, but it was possible. What the feminists wanted was something altogether different. They wanted women to stop being homemakers and mothers and start being men.

Everything the feminists have done has been driven by this goal. They started by heaping ridicule upon homemakers. The way that it was packaged, it appeared as if the feminists were speaking to the men of our country, but the real audience were the homemakers. The feminists said, "Women have been forced to stay at home where they lead lives of drudgery and are unfulfilled. They have no opportunity to have a career and real happiness."

Men raised their eyebrows at this. Most men were working hard, often at a job that they hated, to provide for their families. They would much rather have been doing something else. Men did not work to "be fulfilled" but because it was their duty to take care of their loved ones.

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

What feminists said was total nonsense, and men saw that, but the real audience heard the message just as they were supposed to. Women were made to feel small and insignificant in their role of managing the home and raising the next generation. How absurd for them to be made to feel this way! Yet it happened.

As women followed the Siren's song into the workplace, marriages began crashing onto the rocks, shattered by the impossible strains placed upon them. Men suddenly found themselves working around well dressed young women who all too often had no serious problem with an adulterous affair. Wives found themselves receiving a great deal of attention from the many men that they worked around. Adultery became almost common place and marriages were destroyed.

But the real victims were, and are, the children. We have a generation that has reached adulthood already who do not know what it is to be raised by their real mother and father in a solid family. Instead they have been raised by a single mother, who has brought several "fathers" into the home and perhaps married one or more of them over the lifetime of the child. Studies have shown that children who are living in a situation other than with both of their own biological parents, are many times more likely to be physically and sexually abused. Are these children going to be able to show the next generation how to have a life long marriage? Even if the blight of feminism were removed from our society tomorrow, this unfortunate collection of new adults would be hard pressed to create permanent relationships.

Instead of being gone tomorrow however, feminism is gaining speed. The courts are forcing companies to hire women, and are making it difficult to fire them, even if they are incompetent. The government is overloading its employee base with females. Television and movies are promoting the feminist point of view better than any paid advertisement campaign could hope to. Feminism is planted deep into the vitals of America, and like a cancer, is running wild. It appears to be terminal.

SECTION FOUR - FEMINISM AND AMERICA

Chapter One - The Lethal Attack

THE CASE AGAINST FEMINISM

What Germany and Japan failed to do in the Second World War has been accomplished by liberalism in general, and feminism specifically: the conquering of America. The America of the neighbor-helping, honest, family-oriented and patriotic citizen has been obliterated and replaced by the socialist “Amerika” of the neighbor shunning, tax cheating, self-oriented and traditional-values-hating citizen. How was America beaten?

Armies have known for centuries the power of propaganda. Totalitarian governments, like the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany, knew that controlling the news broadcast and schools, solidified their hold over the people. Citizens who are misinformed by government propaganda are much easier to control. A citizen who agrees with the government is much less likely to revolt. A lie that is commonly accepted, is often more effective and more powerful a mechanism of tyranny than are tanks and bombs.

America has been defeated by a propaganda campaign, unequalled in all of history. All of America’s public institutions, including the courts, legislature, and most of all, the schools have been completely saturated with the enemy’s propaganda. No court, legislative body or public school would dare to attack feminism. Our laws have been changed and enforcement has been uncompromising in supporting the conquerors. Our schools put out a constant stream of feminist doctrine, as if all of American thought prior to 1960 was mere drivel.

All women of the past who were homemakers and mothers are either ignored or held up to actual ridicule, as if they were nothing more than work animals. If a teacher today said to a female student that her lifetime goal should be to be a good homemaker and mother, what would happen to the teacher? Feminism has total control of the schools.

I will discuss the role of media later in this book but in the mean time just think about, where in the national public media do you find the opposition voice to feminism? It does not exist! There are no news stories, documentaries or editorial commentary that casts feminism’s goals in a bad light. There are no television shows or articles in the major magazines of this country that glamorize the role of the homemaker and mother, or that point out the damage caused by America’s acceptance of the feminist religion. Even Rush Limbaugh, whom I respect, with all his “Feminazi” bluster, does not

do that! While he does poke fun at the radical feminists, and opposes abortion, he is firmly in support of the feminist doctrine of a woman going to work and leaving the home to make itself. With this total blanket of feminist propaganda covering our country, America has been conquered and stands defeated. Total, and unconditional, surrender has been declared, and our children are the sacrifice that we have offered up to our new religion.

Chapter Two - The Emasculation of GI Joe

What stood between the United States and Imperial Japan in 1942? What held the Soviet Union at bay until it collapsed? What is the only hope of the United States in withstanding a future enemy from abroad? The fighting men of the United States Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps!

With this knowledge in hand, what should be the goal of the United States with respect to this essential group of men? We should do everything in our power to give them the training, equipment and circumstances with which they can optimize their effectiveness. Nothing should be done which will weaken these forces or make their job more difficult.

Anyone who has been paying attention lately is sharply aware that the military is not focused on defending this nation like it was in the past. Instead it is focused on how to deal with feminist control of the military policy. That has made them less effective than they would have been otherwise. That alone should tell all of us that feminists do not care about the defense of this country. They are traitors to America in favor of their cause.

The military needs men who are physically strong, aggressive, and able to kill a man with their bare hands if necessary. They must be able to spend long periods of time in uncomfortable conditions, with no privacy and no conveniences. There is often need for long marches carrying heavy equipment, followed by strenuous fighting. What type of confused thinking would even attempt to put a woman into that situation: a woman who wouldn't even think about trying to join the men's high school football team, which is far less demanding and a good deal safer?

Whenever the subject is brought up as to why women are put into the military, a quick misdirection is played by the feminists. They say, "I think a woman should have a right to serve their country in

THE CASE AGAINST FEMINISM

the military just like a man can.” The conversation is thusly changed from the needs of the United States military to the needs of the feminist. This selfish turn has been quite effective to date. Americans love freedom and are proud of their rights. By appealing to this part of our natures, feminists have completely distracted the American people from the simple, but critical fact, that no one has a right to join the military! It is not a right at all. The military is in place to protect our country. It has the obligation to choose whom it will take and whom it will not take. Men who are not physically or mentally qualified are not allowed admittance into the service.

The fact is that, if the feminists had not tinkered with the military physical standards, women would be rejected on those grounds alone. That would have ended the problem before it even started. The critical point is this: whomever we put into the military should be chosen because it makes the military stronger and for no other reason! Social justice, political causes or any other considerations are not applicable. No citizen has a right to serve and any discussion based upon that felonious assumption is invalid.

I recently spent some time in the local MEPS (Military Evaluation and Processing Station) while my son processed into the military. I took special notice of the female enlistees as compared with the males. These were not the abnormal near-masculine women who might stand some small chance on the battlefield. They were small, dainty things that would be swept aside by even a sub par male. This is the contribution that feminism has made to the defense of our country!

Even if you are unpatriotic enough to ignore the act of treason that is committed every time we place a female in a unit that requires the strength of a man, what about the women themselves? Who can be crazy enough to put a woman into a situation so unprotected? Only someone who cared absolutely nothing about that woman. If she is not raped, she will be extremely lucky. If war breaks out, her chances are very slim indeed of avoiding attack from her own side, and the enemy will be unmerciful if she is captured. War is not a powder room. It is not even a board room. It is absolutely no place for a woman.

We have recently found that female defenders of the country cannot even defend themselves. The number of military cases of rape, sexual assault, sexual harassment and related unpleasantness

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

should come as no surprise to anyone with an IQ over 90 and who has passed the level of the third grade. Take young healthy males in their sexual prime, trained to be aggressive fighters for their country and then place women in their barracks, tents and foxholes and what do you get? It doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out that the women are out of place, defenseless and perpetual targets. Biology 101.

The military is a place where testosterone runs heavily. The men hang out routinely in strip bars and with prostitutes. When two military men talk about a woman, it is not about her mind or her fighting ability. Placing women into such a group is like striking a match in a room full of gasoline. You can pass laws, and demand that the gasoline will not ignite, but it will just the same. Is that what you really want for your daughter?

Women in the military is a PC concept that is foolish and destructive for both the men and women it jeopardizes. Our military is ever weakened:

- Women are lesser creatures in the macho arena of war. On average they are weaker than men. (See the fitness requirements for the military for men and women.) They carry more fat and less muscle. (See military percent of body standards.) They run slower than men. (See the running requirements for men and women in the military.) The myth of the macho woman finds its substance only in Hollywood movies and TV shows and of course in the minds of those eager to push women into the military. For almost every billet that is filled by a woman, a man was excluded who could of done the job more effectively. A weakness is created.
- Good fighting men, who would be very effective in battle conditions where civilization is at a minimum and macho coupled with discipline is all that matters, are lost to the military because those very characteristics which makes them effective soldiers offended the dainty sensitivities of the female military members.
- With women in the foxholes and on the ships their presence is a constant source of sexual distraction for those who need to remain focused on their jobs to be effective. It lessens the effectiveness of the men who are around them during wartime conditions. It has been demonstrated by the Israeli army that men will risk mission and life to protect women in their units. The Israelis pulled women out of the combat units. We are not wise enough to learn from their mistakes.

THE CASE AGAINST FEMINISM

As the feminists secure their position, what will be coming in the future for the lucky “liberated” women of America? Right now the military, under strict orders from its feminist superiors, is doing everything that it can to entice women into the military. It has lowered the physical and mental standards for women and actively pursues women, preferentially, as enlistees. The result of this all-out campaign is that presently, twenty-five percent of all new enlistees are women. The total female population in the military now stands at fourteen percent. Do you think that the feminists will be happy with these numbers? If you do you have not been paying attention!

When the next opportunity presents itself, the feminists are going to push for a draft in which women will be forced into the military in numbers far more agreeable to the dictatorial feminist mind. Your daughter, sister, or niece will be placed in harm’s way just to satisfy these crazies. If a war does not present itself soon enough for them, they will push for mandatory service during peacetime. That is a certainty!

So, The final question is: why are women being pushed into the military? Is it to make a stronger military, more effective at causing maximum destruction upon an enemy in time of war and protect our national interests? For the reasons listed in the items above it is obvious that this is not the case. We are creating a weaker military with every female that we put in the ranks. That leaves us to wonder why we are cutting our own throats this way. It doesn’t take much reflection or observation to find the treasonous source of the problem. Feminists have realized that as long as men are the protectors of the society, women will remain the protected, like the children, as has been the case throughout all of our known history. This goes against their fantasy world of unisexuality. To protect against this loss of their dream, they are willing to sacrifice any number of women to the horrors of war, rape and abuse. They are willing to sacrifice the protection of the United States. They care for nothing but the furthering of their impossible dream and they would be willing to sacrifice anything to get it, even you. Welcome to the wonderful world of feminism, where the military is the social plaything of the liberal mind and your daughter is a pawn in their power struggle. Wake up and smell the coffee! The iron fist of the tyrannical feminist is crashing down on your country, your society and

your children. They will leave us defenseless in the face of our enemies abroad, and shatter our social structure at home.

Chapter Three - Divorces, why so many?

What do you think of the longevity of the average marriage today? If you aren't appalled by the number of short-term marriages today, you probably are ignorant of the impossibility of a society to remain viable without strong families. Well over half of our marriages will end in divorce. Add this together with the increasingly large number of young adults who don't marry until late in life or not at all, and you find that a long term solid family is becoming a thing of the past.

What is the cause of this devastating fact? A number of years ago I watched a documentary video that was narrated by Helen Reddy, of "I Am Woman" fame. She stated the answer as candidly as anyone, even though she didn't seem to care about the significance of what she was saying. She said that the number of divorces has increased in direct proportion to the number of women who moved into the workplace. Women go to work, families fall apart. This feminist has stated my case as clearly as anyone could. Since society will not remain as a free and viable entity in America without the family, it therefore follows that having women in the workforce is suicidal to America.

That sounds a bit strong doesn't it? Why is this the case? First off, why does a woman working outside the home increase the chances of divorce? It will have an impact on several fronts: 1) Men where she works will be inclined to attempt to draw her into a sexual relationship with them. Look at any office where men and women work together and the sexual tension is constant. When she and her husband have a rough time, as all married couples do, she will have any number of men ready and willing to console her. 2) Men in the workplace will have a ready source of feminine companionship upon whom to unload their sorrows when they have trouble at home. 3) Women at work are almost always dressed their best for work and the men, who are more visually stimulated sexually than women, will compare the sharply dressed females at work with their own wives who may have to dress down at home to handle her responsibilities there. 4) The same individuals who have promoted the working woman have also promoted the sexually free woman, which

THE CASE AGAINST FEMINISM

merely increases the sexuality of the workplace. 5) If a man is not the head of his home, if his home is not his castle, and he is not the bread winner, then he has a reduced role in the family. He feels less responsibility for supporting his wife and when things get rough it is less painful to walk out of the relationship. When a man perceives his wife and children as helpless without him, his male ego drives him to support and protect them. If he perceives them as able to take care of themselves, he has no real need to be there.

This is an incomplete list but you should get the point that women working outside the home, increases the number of divorces. Now, how does that lead to the destruction of our society? Follow if you will. Children perpetuate a society. Not only physically, which is self evident, but ethically, musically, athletically, literarily and in every other way. Now, how do they learn about what their society is? Certain things they will learn outside the family, just living life in the society. But other things, things like ethics, come from the family. Previous generations had a mother at home who passed these ethical values on to their children, day after day, hour by hour, by just being there to instruct as required. Today, children who are raised by the single mom created by divorce, are left alone after school, placed in day care centers before school and put in front of the TV when the working mom finally gets home but is too tired after working all day to even think about teaching ethics. (The ethics of the average TV personality are limited at best.) So, the kids don't learn the ethics of the previous generation and instead are more and more ethics-free. Each year that goes by we see more and more crimes committed by the children who are not being supervised and instructed by this generation of parents. Society has already decayed a great deal over the last 30+ years but it is nothing when compared with what the working woman will inflict on the next thirty years.

When children reach their teens, especially boys, a single mom is incapable of providing the forceful direction that the child needs. A teenage boy can physically overpower his mother and she is left with no channel of instruction other than to plead, hoping to coax cooperation from her son. Dad is not there, and step-dad, if he exists, is resented, which opens the door to a rebellious, uncontrolled boy going his own way. Gangs and other types of criminal behavior becomes far more likely with such boys loose in society.

Chapter Four - Women, the Foundation of Civilization

Picture the Sears Tower in Chicago, standing in majesty, looking down upon all that surrounds it. Tall, proud and beautiful, its glass walls reflecting the sunlight in splendor. An amazing feat of engineering. Now picture that structure as its foundation is suddenly and magically removed. What do you see? What will happen to it? The supporting members reaching up into the heart of the building, will suddenly have nothing to push against and their support will vanish. The entire tower will fall immediately. A pile of rubble will be all that is left of the glorious giant.

Women have always provided the foundational support for civilization. The edifice of our modern society would never have existed if not for the civilizing influence of women upon men. Women cause men to settle down, and to look to family and security. Women inspire men to achieve in the business world by their moral support and yes, their need to be provided for. Women have trained the boys of each generation the proper way to behave in a civilized society. The traditional role women have had historically in civilization is critical and provides the foundation for all else.

Now, remove that influence and what happens? Look around you and there you will see the answer. As feminism has pulled the foundation out from under our civilization, by convincing women that in the workforce lies their destiny instead of being wives and mothers. Men are now forced to compete with women at work instead of joining with them in a family. The house where couples live is no longer a home, where children are always cared for and supervised. Men are no longer in a position of sole bread winner and therefore do not have a known and well defined role in the family. They are leaving their families in record numbers every day. Civilization is beginning to crumble rapidly, as crime increases and neighborhoods become nothing but a collection of strangers who do not take care of each other. Children are raising themselves and learning many things from their friends, television, movies and even the Internet, that parents should be appalled at. But since the foundation of our society has been removed, the trend of the work-orphaned children continues and accelerates.

The remaining holdouts, women who are still willing to support the civilization that we all rely on, are held up to ridicule by the feminists. Fingers are pointed, pity handed out and even disgust is

THE CASE AGAINST FEMINISM

shown for the homemaker/housewife. They are made to feel inferior to women who have a career. They are ridiculously told that they "don't work" because they stay at home. A homemaker works as hard or harder than any CEO does in their job of taking care of a family. They work day and night and always have another task calling for their attention. But the truth is never a guide to the feminist.

While women are busy trying to build offices in the tower of civilization, they have no awareness that they are removing the foundation of that same building. They are rearranging their office furniture in a collapsing structure, whose collapse is a result of their leaving the job of providing the foundation, for a job in the penthouse. The penthouse will soon be a pile of rubble, just like the rest of society. This is insane.

Feminists hold all women of the past in complete disregard. Until their movement came along, they believe, all women were no more than donkeys, and slaves, providing nothing but pleasure and services to men. That which was indispensable for society is trivialized by these confused ladies. With the exception of just a handful of women, who did not perform the wifely and motherly duties of their peers, the feminist views all women before their movement existed as insignificant bimbos, oppressed and useless. This from a group who claims to speak for women and to have women's best interests at heart.

Contrast this, if you will, with the view of the male chauvinist, with his hated chivalry. He is said to hate women, and to want nothing but to enslave and use women. Yet what is his view of women? He views them as different than men, special and indispensable. He gives his seat to a lady and opens her door for her, OUT OF RESPECT. When he marries it is to bond for life with his chosen mate. He will do all in his power to support her, care for her and protect her. He will attempt to provide her with the best house, car and anything else that she desires. He is focused on her happiness and treasures her more than life itself. He supports her in the raising of the children, supplying the strong enforcement of the rules that she would not be able to provide without his help. He has a leadership role in the family but he confers with his wife always, and defers often to her opinion. His family is a team that is built for durability and designed to last a lifetime. He knows the critical importance of a woman's role as housewife and mother. He teaches his children to

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

respect and honor the woman who is their mother. He looks at the women of history as wonderful, hard working and important people, who built all that we see around us by their efforts.

Feminists are the women haters and have only the destruction of women in their sites. The vast majority of male chauvinists love and respect women and have only these wonderful creatures' happiness as a goal. Feminism breaks families up, leaving women as single mothers struggling to get by, and in danger from the gangs of boys who have not been raised by a functional two- parent family. Male chauvinism builds strong families and provides protection, security and respect for women.

The distortion of the facts by the politically correct feminists is as common as it is disgusting. The feminist arrogance and accusatory posturing when confronted is a clear indication of their intellectually weak position. The way that they have been able to slander the character of all male chauvinists as well as all of the honorable, hardworking homemakers in our society should make all honest people angry. The families that have been destroyed and the countless women left as single mothers because of feminist propaganda is enough to make you want to cry.

We need to start honoring the homemaker and inspiring women to take up that vital role again, or we will pay an unthinkable price. We can do quite well without female soldiers or sailors. We can do nicely without female judges, lawyers, or CEO's. But we will collapse as a civilization without dedicated homemakers and mothers. We must set our priorities back to a sane arrangement or we will suffer a horrible fate.

Chapter Five - Feminists and Freedom

I think that it is important to differentiate between two kinds of freedom. The first is good and desirable: freedom from government interference in our daily lives. The second is bad and should be avoided: freedom from personal responsibility. When the word "freedom" is recklessly thrown about, without differentiating between these two, many dangerous and foolish concepts can appear to be good and merely in support of that which is dear to the hearts of all Americans. How do these two types of freedom come into play in the area of feminism?

THE CASE AGAINST FEMINISM

Freedom from government interference in our daily lives is under attack by the feminist movement!

The government is at war with Parents who wish to teach their children that a mother belongs at home and a father must support his family! The public schools, by direction of the government, will attack these parents' position with all of their power. A teacher would be fired if he were so bold as to even suggest that a young girl might find a happy and worthwhile life as a homemaker, because the government has determined that freedom of thought is only applicable, in American schools, if it is Politically Correct thought. There can be no greater intrusion upon a citizen's rights than to take his children and brainwash them with doctrines of the state that run counter to his own beliefs!

If a private citizen wishes to start up a business, he is suddenly without freedom to choose whom he will hire in his business. This absurd situation has come about through the recent activities of our ever expanding government, and the activities of the feminist movement. Our constitutional freedom is rapidly evaporating because of the governmental support for, and enforcement of, Politically Correct thinking. If you do not worship at the fountain of Politically Correct Thought, you will feel the weight of the government upon your neck!

If that citizen, instead of creating his own company, chooses to go to work for another company, he will find that his opinions and actions must be politically correct also. This is not because the company is necessarily in support of politically correct activities but it has set its PC policies because our government has opened the door to legal abuse of any company which does not follow the PC line. The strong arm tactics of the government has turned all of American companies into little PC robots in the area of Human Relations policy.

Over a certain area of our lives, the government has taken totalitarian control. That area is expanding each day. Like a hose pouring out water onto a rug, the area of contamination is spreading ever wider. The people in government have determined that they know better than you do how to run your own life. They have decided whether or not you should smoke, wear your seat belt, or support PC causes. In the area of personal freedom, they are stealing from you with each step that they take, just as surely as if they had put a

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

gun in your face and demanded your wallet. (The IRS is doing that, literally, at the same time!)

Freedom from personal responsibility is constantly supported by the feminist movement!

While the PC crowd does everything in their power to seize control of your freedoms by use of our government, at the very same time they are proclaiming a glorious day of release from personal responsibility for all citizens. We are told that feminists are in support of freedom for women, at the same time they are picking all women's pockets through taxes to support their useless programs. What freedoms are they really in support of?

1.The freedom for women to have sex without any consequences. In spite of the fact that single-mothers abound and are having their lives turned upside down because of it, this "freedom" is proclaimed by the feminists. 2.The freedom for women to kill their children. Abortion is the murder of a child, who most often is a female, in order to free a woman from the responsibilities of her own actions. (Rape and incest are not even a blip on the screen of the total number of abortions. To even mention those rare exceptions is nothing but dishonest misdirection by the feminists.) 3.The freedom for women to abandon their children to day care centers and other locations, in order to pursue a career. This frees the mother up from the critical task of raising the next generation and guarantees that soon our society will collapse. 4.The freedom for men to abandon their role of bread winner and thereby ensure that men will only be a short-term visitor in the home. The huge majority of children today are not raised by both of their real parents. It has been clearly demonstrated that children who are not raised by their own biological parents are far more likely to be abused in every way.

It is time for a reality check!

It appears that those of the feminist movement labor under the misconception that all of life is but a search for personal ego fulfillment and gratification. Job, family and all other things are to take a back seat to personal happiness. That approach to life is what is pulling this country down. If the hard things, like being a mother and father, raising children and supporting a family are less important than your personal gratification and fulfillment, then we might as well call the whole thing off right now and close the country down for lack of interest.

THE CASE AGAINST FEMINISM

The feminists are forever complaining that all women are not cut out to be homemakers. Are all men cut out to work a job and support a family? Of course not! But life is hard, and you do what you have to do. A sense of duty gets a man out of bed every morning and out the door to work, even though he is not fulfilled by going to work. It is patently absurd to demand that everyone who supports society by doing the right thing must be fulfilled by doing it!

Take a look around you. Most men do not have a career at all but rather a job that they perform to support their families. Men have chosen those jobs based upon what job is available and whether or not it will provide the money their families need. Being fulfilled was seldom the major consideration. Aptitude was required or he would not get paid for doing a job but that was as far as it went.

Long term, without families no one is going to be safe and no one is going to have freedom of any sort. Feminists mistakenly believe that women can cast off their responsibilities of being wives and mothers and live off of society without contributing to it in the important area of raising the next generation.

We have a duty to society to raise the next generation. If a woman sidesteps her duty, leaving it to another, then she is creating an unnecessary load upon our civilization. If a man leaves his family and does not support them, then he is creating an unnecessary load upon our civilization. What the feminists have done is to say that no one has any personal responsibilities anymore. Men and women are exactly the same in role, and the children are of no concern. Men do not need to support their families and women do not need to raise their children. Marriage is passé and adultery is not a big deal. They have destroyed the arrangement which produced continuity of morals and societal conscience: that which perpetuates our society and culture.

"Let us, before we die, gather up our heritage, and offer it to our children." Will Durant.

Chapter Six - The Joy of Sexism

Have you ever noticed how people who can't win with facts and logic always resort to name calling? The feminists are no exception. Here we have a group of people who have labeled all dissenters as "sexist." The word is fairly dripping with disgust when they use it. Anyone deserving of such a name must be a low life subhuman

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

scoundrel. Indeed, we have to look all the way back to the days of the troglodytes to find anyone as undeveloped as a sexist. You can see men dodging quickly to the political left to avoid the stigma of being called a (dirty, rotten, worthless) sexist.

PC name calling, contrary to the children's poem, strikes with great force. In fact, sticks and stones may have less of an impact when you consider that the courts have taken the ridiculous negative connotations of these names seriously! The ground gained by the feminist movement has been driven by shaming men into acting unnaturally. Anyone who is privy to discussions between men about women knows that men have not changed their opinions about women a bit, despite their mouthing of all the right PC terms when women are present. Many men have tried to think like the feminists want but then another short skirted honey walks by and all their good intentions are out the window.

The world is sexist, from the lowest insect to the most intellectual of men. You will find that in the animal kingdom, males and females have roles that are very different. In the human realm, the same is true. The feminists have forced an unnatural condition to exist in America today, through the courts. It is unnatural, and therefore doomed to be only temporary. The only reason one has for opposing such a short term problem is that feminism destroys families.

On average, women are weaker than men. This is a fact that cannot be denied by any rational person. Men are more aggressive than women and have held the large majority of the leadership positions of every human society that has ever existed. These facts are born out throughout history and around the world. Women have always been more nurturing than men. Children throughout history have clung to their mothers' love as a universal constant, giving them something that fathers never could. This is basic and rooted in the biological factors that will survive long after all those living today are gone. Those who accept these facts are called sexist. They are of course! All people are sexist and can be no other way. Wake up and smell the coffee! Sexism is as natural as the sunrise and therefore is a good thing. To make sexism a dirty word is twisted and pathological!

Every time a women puts on a dress, makeup and high heels, she is sexist. Every time a man puts on a business suit he is sexist. When a man shaves his face or a woman shaves her legs, it is sexist.

THE CASE AGAINST FEMINISM

When a man and women make love it is sexist and when a child is born from a woman it is sexist. When a mother nurses her baby, that is sexist. All of life is shaped by sexism because sex is a reality of life which shapes all humans from the moment of conception until death. It is not avoidable and should not be.

What of male chauvinism? Can that be avoided? The data are in on this one! In America we have demonstrated both positively and negatively that male chauvinism is necessary for a strong nation. With male chauvinism firmly in place, our country grew from a handful of colonies to the greatest nation on earth. Women were treated better here than ever before in history. Society expected a man to stay with his wife and raise the children he sired, through financial support and leadership in the home. Divorce was something for the minority not the majority of families. Children grew up living with and respecting both of their parents and learned the difference between right and wrong in the home environment.

Now, through brain washing the children in school and rulings of the court, male chauvinism is considered bad. What has been the result? The obvious statistic that jumps out at you is that the vast majority of children are not raised by both of their own biological parents. Children are neglected by their single working mothers or having great psychological difficulties dealing with step parents.

Men have been "liberated" far more than women have by the removal of male chauvinism. Men are not expected by society to take a leadership role in the family. Since that is the only role nature has equipped them for, they have no role in the family. Therefore they leave! Women are trying to be the bread winners and even that role is gone from the men. What is left but to become single and go on the prowl. Men do not get married as early in life, if at all, today and women still are having babies. It doesn't take rocket science to understand the implications of that fact. Women are having their lives ruined by single motherhood and removing male chauvinism is why.

A man will be "king of his castle." Either it will be with a wife or without her, depending on whether or not she will support him in his kingship. Biology has dictated this. Whether you or I like it, agree with it, or loath it, makes absolutely no difference. Just like the law of gravity, you may not like it but you will have to deal with it anyway.

Chapter Seven - The Tepid Center

It is often proclaimed that the moderate is what we all should wish to be or become. The even, calm temperament of the middle of the road guy is believed to be what creates peace and happiness in society. When it comes to issues, he somehow always falls on the PC side of any question. He supports abortion, affirmative action, and of course feminism.

The middle of the road today is laid out on the same ground that was occupied only by the left wing radical of the 1960's. What was the middle of the road then is now considered extreme right wing. Is the middle of the road a safe place to live? Or will you simply get run over?

The moderate does not believe in anything per se. Instead he only is worried about appearances. He wants to make sure that he causes no waves. He is lukewarm and pliable at all times. A center position is always right to him, no matter what it is. An interesting quote about moderation from the Bible is:

I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth. Revelation 3:15, 16

However you feel about the Bible, you can see that moderation is not considered to be the best course of action by everyone. If you don't believe in anything, of course you will have no passion about issues, and you think anyone who does is unbalanced and foolish. The society is controlled by those who are living outside the middle of the road, and the moderate is happy to follow along like a sheep. Strong belief is baaaaaaaad.

In the area of feminism, we have two groups fighting for what they believe is right. The ones who are frantically trying to save the families of America and those who are just as frantically trying to destroy them. When you realize that much of the hard-core feminist doctrine comes from the same source as the lesbian agenda does, it is clear why the family is so hated, and men are not wanted to have a role. As the feminist bumper sticker says, "A woman needs a man like a fish needs a bicycle." The family supporters say, "A woman needs a man and a man needs a woman, to be complete." The moderate says, "Whatever the polls indicate."

The polls seem to be saying that fish do not need bicycles. Feminism has been packaged up to be sold to the moderate. Its propo-

THE CASE AGAINST FEMINISM

nents have created an image of moderation to mask the radical nature of their beliefs. The moderates have swallowed the image completely and as a result have given the radical feminists control of our daily lives.

In the United States today, it is illegal to be a business owner and to be anti-feminist! Just think, in "the land of the free" you can be sued for not hiring women in your business, even if you feel that your business would operate better with all men. If you do hire a woman, you must create a powder puff environment for them to work in or you will be sued. You must be careful what you say, what you do and what you put up on the walls of your business or the legal system will shut you down. Does that sound like freedom to you? Perhaps it sounds more like totalitarianism! If hiring women will give a company an advantage over a competitor, then all companies will hire women, without the courts getting involved. In the sports world, once the color line was broken, no team could afford not to hire the high quality player of a non-white race. No quota laws were required. No affirmative action laws were needed. If a company makes more money by hiring a certain type of person, then they hire that type of person. If not, then they should have the right not to hire that type of person. In a totalitarian society, the state tells you who to hire and how much to pay them. In America, obviously we are tired of freedom and want the strong hand of a totalitarian government to tell us what to think, what to do, and how we should live.

Where is Little Bo Peep when you need her?¹

**COLLECTED ARTI-
CLES 1997-2018**

“WHY MY LOGO?” (N.D.)

I have been asked by folks, both those that know me and those that do not, why I would use a picture of a man holding a big ol’ club in one hand and dragging a woman by the hair with the other. Anyone who knows me, knows that I would never strike my wife or injure her in any way. I would inflict bodily harm on anyone else who did such a thing to her. I am her protector, not her tormentor.

So, back to the question, why the logo? The caveman symbolizes the macho, masculine male who ruled his world, and protected his woman. The old myth of the caveman obtaining his mate by hitting her over the head with a club, and then dragging her off into his cave, is lampooned in my logo. Feminists hate the idea of a strong, leading male and the idea of a woman who loves that very kind of male. (Notice the hearts coming from the woman in the logo. Here is symbolized a happy woman, with her masculine man.) This hits feminists right in the insane world where they try to live. That is the reason for the logo.²

“THE CHAUVINIST CORNER’S AXIOMS OF LIFE” (N.D.)

The axioms of life subscribed to by the Chauvinist Corner

I

A man must never hit a woman.

II

A man must not stand by and allow a woman to be attacked by another man.

III

A marriage is for life.

IV

A man should provide the entire support for his family.

V

A man must pledge his life to protect his family from physical, emotional and financial harm.

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

VI

A wife must be home and supervising minor children anytime that the children are not in school.

VII

Sex must only occur inside of a marriage.

VIII

A man must benevolently rule his own house.

IX

A man must instill respect into his children for their mother and provide disciplinary support for her motherly leadership.

X

A lady must be treated with respect by a man.

XI

A woman is out of place in business, and if she is there, a woman should not be placed in authority over a man.³

"FAIRNESS AND THE FEMINIST" (JULY 1997)

What is fairness? Usually it is where two or more people are placed into a situation where each of them is treated equally well or equally badly. The same rules being applied to all parties is fairness. However, the concept of fairness has become ambiguous today. **Instead of equal treatment for equal behavior, the liberal mind has determined that opportunity to succeed must be equal even if talents and efforts are not.** To anyone who thinks about it, such an arrangement cannot be fair but it is called "fairness" none the less.

In America, right from the start, it was considered fair for the wealthy to live life at a standard significantly different than the poor. The advantage of this arrangement was that poor people were highly motivated to produce money making efforts to move themselves and their children from poverty into a situation more closely resembling the wealthy. Opportunity was not equal then, *nor rea-*

sonably can it ever be. Instead, opportunity will rationally always favor those who can contribute the most effort, intelligence, education and money towards any endeavor. The American system, as originally conceived can move all people out of poverty who want to be moved out badly enough.

But today a political movement has taken root which has changed the basic premise of American thought. Now, it is considered a good thing to remove results as the criteria for improving your lot in life, to use instead the criteria of skin color, gender and language to guarantee improvement in one's lot. This is the opposite of fairness and it is destructive to society to pursue that course of action. When lesser results are rewarded, where is the incentive for better results?

The idea that a less educated or talented person, is given a job or raise in pay because of their gender or skin color over another person of a different skin color or gender who has a better education or more talent, is unfair, illogical and puts a severe drain on industry. A far more fair, logical and productive approach would be to inspire children of all races and cultures to achieve education and to work hard. This would raise their standard of living and their self esteem by earning what they have rather than lowering it by insulting their dignity with charity.

This topic relates to feminism in various ways but it is crystal clear that feminists do not want fairness! A man cannot take large amounts of time off to have children and to make a half hearted effort at raising them for a couple of years and then return to work at the same job and expect to keep pace with those who have been on the job all the time he was off work. It would be obscenely unfair to expect the other workers to be mistreated that way without anger. Yet feminists demand that women be allowed to do this! Such insanity should be laughed out of existence!

Feminists think that the government, or a company should be forced to pay for baby sitters for women so that they can shirk their duty in raising their own offspring, and still be paid an equal wage for this obviously inferior contribution that they are providing at work. This is absurd but feminists are adamant that this absurdity is "fairness."

In the workplace, feminists demand that women can flirt, tell dirty jokes and make sexist comments at will, and then turn around

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

completely in the other direction and sue companies that allow men the same rights. It is absurd but it is feminism.

If America wants to remain great, it had better get its definition of fairness straightened out before it goes the way of the Soviet Union where "fairness" drove them into bankruptcy. They found that rewarding non-production at an equal level with production, breeds less production. We have started down this same path with affirmative action.

Feminism proclaims minority status for women. This cannot be confused with fairness by any rational standard, but this is yet one more absurdity demanded by feminists. We need a "nonsense detector" in government. The liberal is doing everything he can to destroy the American way of life and to replace it with the old Soviet one. Equality regardless of results is anti-American and belittles each and every person on both sides of the unfair treatment. A person who receives "help" from the government through affirmative action has not earned anything himself to be proud of. You do not properly value that which you do not earn yourself. To those who do not receive special treatment, is left the feeling that what they have accomplished with their own two hands is not as important as it would have been otherwise. Both the recipient and the non-recipient of special treatment are harmed by its existence.

Every female soldier and sailor has had her job given to her. She could not earn it herself, by beating men out in a fair competition of physical and mental skills. What does this say about those women? They are tokens and nothing more. Is that how to build self esteem? They are wasting the time and energy of the military, as well as the tax dollars that Americans pay out for their defense. The myriad of problems that are generated every time a women enters a base, a barracks and a ship have no sane reason to exist at all.

If you look up the word "absurdity" in the dictionary, feminism would be most appropriately used as the prime example of it. "Fairness," on the other hand, would be correctly found listed as an antonym to feminism.⁴

"FEMINISM AND DIVORCE" (JULY 1997)

What do you think of the longevity of the average marriage today? If you aren't appalled by the number of short-term marriages

today, you probably are ignorant of the impossibility of a society to remain viable without strong families. Well over half of our marriages will end in divorce. Add this together with the increasingly large number of young adults who don't marry until late in life or not at all, and you find that a long term solid family is becoming a thing of the past.

What is the cause of this devastating fact? A number of years ago I watched a documentary video that was narrated by Helen Reddy, of "I Am Woman" fame. She stated the answer as candidly as anyone, even though she didn't seem to care about the significance of what she was saying. She said that the number of divorces has increased in direct proportion to the number of women who moved into the workplace. Women go to work, families fall apart. This feminist has stated my case as clearly as anyone could. Since society will not remain as a free and viable entity in America without the family, it therefore follows that having women in the workforce is suicidal to America.

That sounds a bit strong doesn't it? Why is this the case? First off, why does a woman working outside the home increase the chances of divorce? It will have an impact on several fronts: 1) Men where she works will be inclined to attempt to draw her into a sexual relationship with them. Look at any office where men and women work together and the sexual tension is constant. When she and her husband have a rough time, as all married couples do, she will have any number of men ready and willing to console her. 2) Men in the workplace will have a ready source of feminine companionship upon whom to unload their sorrows when they have trouble at home. 3) Women at work are almost always dressed their best for work and the men, who are more visually stimulated sexually than women, will compare the sharply dressed females at work with their own wives who may have to dress down at home to handle her responsibilities there. 4) The same individuals who have promoted the working woman have also promoted the sexually free woman, which merely increases the sexuality of the workplace. 5) If a man is not the head of his home, if his home is not his castle, and he is not the bread winner, then he has a reduced role in the family. He feels less responsibility for supporting his wife and when things get rough it is less painful to walk out of the relationship. When a man perceives his wife and children as helpless without him, his male ego drives

him to support and protect them. If he perceives them as able to take care of themselves, he has no real need to be there.

This is an incomplete list but you should get the point that women working outside the home, increases the number of divorces. Now, how does that lead to the destruction of our society? Follow if you will. Children perpetuate a society. Not only physically, which is self evident, but ethically, musically, athletically, literarily and in every other way. Now, how do they learn about what their society is? Certain things they will learn outside the family, just living life in the society. But other things, things like ethics, come from the family. Previous generations had a mother at home who passed these ethical values on to their children, day after day, hour by hour, by just being there to instruct as required. Today, children who are raised by the single mom created by divorce, are left alone after school, placed in day care centers before school and put in front of the TV when the working mom finally gets home but is too tired after working all day to even think about teaching ethics. (The ethics of the average TV personality are limited at best.) So, the kids don't learn the ethics of the previous generation and instead are more and more ethics-free. Each year that goes by we see more and more crimes committed by the children who are not being supervised and instructed by this generation of parents. Society has already decayed a great deal over the last 30+ years but it is nothing when compared with what the working woman will inflict on the next thirty years.

When children reach their teens, especially boys, a single mom is incapable of providing the forceful direction that the child needs. A teenage boy can physically overpower his mother and she is left with no channel of instruction other than to plead, hoping to coax cooperation from her son. Dad is not there, and step-dad, if he exists, is resented, which opens the door to a rebellious, uncontrolled boy going his own way. Gangs and other types of criminal behavior becomes far more likely with such boys loose in society. The storm clouds are gathering on the horizon.

A sad aside is that when a woman went to work to "supplement the family income" she added nothing at all to the standard of living to the family which she was abandoning. Instead, we have seen prices and taxes increase, because of the two income family, at a rate where the family now uses the mom's entire income just to cover the increases and they are financially worse off than they were

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

in the 1950's, when mom stayed at home! We have sacrificed the foundation of our society, the family, on the altar of the feminist god of unisexuality. It is absurd, destructive and suicidal but still we brainwash our children into believing that there are no differences between the sexes and that their roles should be identical. At the same time they are taught by the TV female role models, that either women dress for sex, think only of sex and are used for sex and little else or, even further from reality, women are men: evenly matched in in a fair fight, able to beat men up and are physically equal in every way. (From such stupidity has come the laws forcing lower entrance standards and thereby creating the female pseudo-soldier, the female pseudo-policeman and the female pseudo-fireman.) The mother at home is ridiculed and only the working woman has any real value. Whence has departed the dignity of the wife? Whence departed the goddess stature of the mother? Indeed it has been traded for the ridiculous and the profane and the whirlwind will be our just wage.⁵

"ARE WOMEN SEX OBJECTS?" (JULY 1997)

There can only be one honest answer to this question. Men's magazines would go broke, 1-900 numbers wouldn't exist, Madison Avenue would not pour big dollars into model's fees, and men would not stop whatever they are doing to watch a woman walk by if they were not. Face it, prostitution would never be the oldest profession unless women were sex objects. All across the nation we see billboards, and mud flaps showing off the female body. Why? Because this curvaceous form has a predictable effect on males. It is not just a conscious reaction! The pupils of the male eye will actually change state when seeing a picture of a woman's body. Commercial advertising of all types take advantage of this by using these sex objects, trying to associate the mental image of bedding a beautiful babe with their product. Television shows and movies put as many naked, or near naked, women into their shows as they can. Men just can't get enough of those sex objects.

Contrary to the feminist drivel, women want to be sex objects as well! Why are high-heels popular with women? It is not because women are afraid of being vertically challenged. It is not because the heels are comfortable to wear. It is because it makes the calf

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

muscles stand out which enhances the sexual appeal of their bodies. Why do women wear short skirts? These lovely ladies have to fight all day to make sure their knees are together to avoid publicly parading their underwear, while repeatedly checking the hem to make sure it hasn't pulled up embarrassingly and they have to be very careful when they bend over to pick something up for the same reason. What is the point of going through all of that hassle? Obviously it is to make men think of them as sex objects. What of tight pants, low-cut blouses, see-through materials, and makeup? How about shorts, thin shirts which reveal the shape of their mammary papilla in clear highlight, and peek-a-boo slits up their long skirts? All of it highlights the sexuality of the woman, enhancing her image as a sex-object.

At one level or another you already know this. It wouldn't even be worth mentioning except for the fact that it is completely contrary to the feminist dogma of today. We are told that women are not sex objects and the they don't want to be thought of as sex objects. These two key tenets of the feminist commandments, proclaimed to be straight from the feminist goddess of policy, are clearly made of the same fertilizer as the rest of the "ideas" in this false religion. They are out and out lies. Being a sex object is one aspect of every woman. The degree to which she wishes herself to be thought of in that manner will be shown in her attire and the way she walks, talks and flirts. But it is one of the things that is always evaluated about her by everyone she meets during the day. This simple fact seems to be a taboo subject, in spite of its obvious truth.

Many feminists have aggressively tried to fight against this basic law of nature. Some dress in manly, or unkempt clothes to try and hide the fact that they are sex objects. But the general population of women are quite comfortable with the facts of life. Being sexually desirable is something that most women are proud of, or else they would not dress in a fashion to highlight that side of their being. The unnatural aspect of this issue comes into the picture when the feminist, head buried firmly in the sand, proclaims that all of this sex appeal doesn't exist, or can be changed. If politicians would ignore these poor, frustrated feminists who are angry, sad, ignorant (even though often intelligent) ladies, we could all pity their confused and ludicrous beliefs, as they properly warrant. Unfortunately the courts

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

and the congress are so terrified of not being PC that they listen to these hallucinating woman, believing them to be rational.

Good luck America you are going to need it with these loony-tunes running around controlling what you think, say and do.⁶

“FEMALE ‘DEFENDERS OF THE COUNTRY’ CAN’T EVEN DEFEND THEMSELVES” (JULY 1997)

The number of military cases of rape, sexual assault, sexual harassment and related unpleasantness should come as no surprise to anyone with an IQ over 90 and who has passed the level of the third grade. Take young healthy males in their sexual prime, trained to be aggressive fighters for their country and then place women in their barracks, tents and foxholes and what do you get? It doesn’t take a rocket scientist to figure out that the women are out of place, defenseless and perpetual targets. Biology 101.

Women in the military may be a PC concept but it is foolish and destructive for both the men and women it jeopardizes. Our military is ever weakened:

- Women are lesser creatures in the macho arena of war. On average they are weaker than men. (See the fitness requirements for the military for men and women.) They carry more fat and less muscle. (See military percent of body standards.) They run slower than men. (See the running requirements for men and women in the military.) The myth of the macho woman finds its substance only in Hollywood movies and TV shows and of course in the minds of those eager to push women into the military. For almost every billet that is filled by a woman, a man was excluded who could of done the job more effectively. A weakness is created.
- Good fighting men, who would be very effective in battle conditions where civilization is at a minimum and macho coupled with discipline is all that matters, are lost to the military because those very characteristics which makes them effective soldiers offended the dainty sensitivities of the female military members.
- With women in the foxholes and on the ships their presence is a constant source of sexual distraction for those who need to remain focused on their jobs to be effective. It lessens the ef-

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

fectiveness of the men who are around them during wartime conditions. It has been demonstrated by the Israeli army that men will risk mission and life to protect women in their units. The Israelis pulled women out of the combat units. We are not wise enough to learn from their mistakes.

So, The final question is: **why are women being pushed into the military?** Is it to make a stronger military, more effective at causing maximum destruction upon an enemy in time of war and protect our national interests? For the reasons listed in the items above it is obvious that this is not the case. We are creating a weaker military with every female that we put in the ranks. That leaves us to wonder why we are cutting our own throats this way. It doesn't take much reflection or observation to find the treasonous source of the problem. Feminists have realized that as long as men are the protectors of the society, women will remain the protected, like the children, as has been the case throughout all of our known history. This goes against their fantasy world of unisexuality. To protect against this loss of their dream, they are willing to sacrifice any number of women to the horrors of war, rape and abuse. They are willing to sacrifice the protection of the United States. They care for nothing but the furthering of their impossible dream and they would be willing to sacrifice anything to get it, even you.⁷

"A WOMAN'S PLACE" (4 JULY 1997)

*The only sight, upon my eyes,
that guarantees delight,
The only voice I need to hear,
in darkness every night,
The only smile I crave to reap,
my happiness to share,
The only thing upon my mind,
whenever she's not there,
The only part of my true self,
that can exist apart,
The source of all my joy,
to satisfy my heart,*

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

*It is she, my love, my wife,
where these things abide,
And my success was made complete
when she became my bride!
Now, after six and twenty years,
I cannot have a doubt,
My Golden girl, by my side
is all I have to tout.
When I speak of "a woman's place,"
there's no uncertainty,
Beside her man, sharing life,
is where she ought to be.
For only she can make a home
from just a house alone,
And only she can fill a man
with pride that's all his own.
She completes the incomplete,
she makes a man a whole,
She gives a man what he most needs,
right to his very soul!
This I say, straight from the heart,
this is my very life...
This is the woman that I love,
this is my precious wife.
A woman's place is in the home,
or home it cannot be.
After six and twenty years,
it's very clear to me!⁸*

"STEFFI GRAF DEFEATS ANDRE AGASSI FOR WORLD TITLE" (31 JULY 1997)

What? You haven't seen this headline in the papers? You don't expect to either I should imagine. Back in the 1970's it was a big media event when Bobby Riggs challenged the world's best female tennis players to singles matches. Billie Jean King who was number one declined to play him but Margaret Court, who was number two, accepted. Bobby Riggs easily won that match. Why did this make news? Because Bobby Riggs was nearly sixty, a very old man for

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

professional sports. Finally Billie Jean accepted and defeated Bobby Riggs (which is the only thing that is ever mentioned today, when the subject comes up) but the fact remains that he beat the number two woman in the world.

Female sports are, like the Special Olympics, for lesser athletes. The female sports that have a long standing of support are ones that show off the female form exceptionally well. The fit and trim girls running around in their mini-skirted tennis outfits, playing peek-a-booo with every serve, and any breeze that comes along, has a large following. The ice-skaters, with their steamy outfits are also very popular. Promoters of female professional football learned that covering up the female body is death to fan support because the actual play is far inferior to that of the men.

The baseball Silver Bullets, dressed in the typical men's baseball uniform, have an excellent professional manager, and draw on the very best female talent in the country for their team players, and yet they have an abysmal won-loss record, while playing games only with second rate pickup teams of men players. If they hope do more than merely survive, living off the grace of their dedicated sponsor and the fanatical feminists, and instead actually grow into a full fledged female sport, they must learn the lesson of other successful women's sports, and show off what they have that is entertaining. (The fledgling WNBA should also take note and design their uniforms accordingly.)

Biology has dictated that men be better athletes than women and the feminists have valiantly, but vainly, argued against it. Politically they have gotten much of what they have demanded but demanding that the sun is not bright, no matter how forcefully, doesn't make it so, even with supreme court approval.⁹

"STICKS AND STONES" (31 JULY 1997)

Have you ever noticed how people who can't win with facts and logic always resort to name calling? The feminists are no exception. Here we have a group of people who have labeled all dissenters as "sexist." The word is fairly dripping with disgust when they use it. Anyone deserving of such a name must be a low life subhuman scoundrel. Indeed, we have to look all the way back to the days of the troglodytes to find anyone as undeveloped as a sexist. You can

see men dodging quickly to the political left to avoid the stigma of being called a (dirty, rotten, worthless) sexist.

Other terms that are used as weapons are “male chauvinist,” “Neanderthal,” “woman-hater,” and the ever popular and all encompassing “bigot.” These names, contrary to the children’s poem, do strike with great force today. In fact, sticks and stones may have less of an impact when you consider that the courts have taken the ridiculous negative connotations of these terms seriously! The ground gained by the feminist movement has been driven by shaming men into acting unnaturally. Anyone who is privy to discussions between men about women knows that men have not changed their opinions about women a bit, despite their mouthing of all the right PC terms when women are present. Many men have tried to think like the feminists want but then another short skirted honey walks by and all their good intentions are out the window.

The world is sexist, from the lowest insect to the most intellectual of men. You will find that in the animal kingdom, males and females have roles that are very different. In the human realm, the same is true. The feminists have forced an unnatural condition to exist in America today, through the courts. It is unnatural, and therefore doomed to be only temporary. The only reason one has for opposing such a short term problem is that feminism destroys families. (See Feminism and Divorce) America cannot exist as a free nation without families, and so feminism is destroying America with every step that it takes in advancing its hopeless cause.

On average, women are weaker than men. This is a fact that cannot be denied by any rational person. Men are more aggressive than women and have held the large majority of the leadership positions of every human society that has ever existed. These facts are born out throughout history and around the world. Women have always been more nurturing than men. Children throughout history have clung to their mothers’ love as a universal constant, giving them something that fathers never could. This is basic and rooted in the biological factors that will survive long after all those living today are gone. Those who accept these facts are called sexist. They are of course! All people are sexist and can be no other way. Wake up and smell the coffee! Sexism is as natural as the sunrise and therefore is a good thing. To make sexism a dirty word is twisted and pathological!

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

Every time a women puts on a dress, makeup and high heels, she is sexist. Every time a man puts on a business suit he is sexist. When a man shaves his face or a woman shaves her legs, it is sexist. When a man and women make love it is sexist and when a child is born from a woman it is sexist. When a mother nurses her baby, that is sexist. All of life is shaped by sexism because sex is a reality of life which shapes all humans from the moment of conception until death. It is not avoidable and should not be.

What of male chauvinism? Can that be avoided? No! In America we have demonstrated both negatively and positively that male chauvinism is necessary for a strong nation. With male chauvinism firmly in place, our country grew from a handful of colonies to the greatest nation on earth. Women were treated better here than ever before in history. Society expected a man to stay with his wife and raise the children he sired, through financial support and leadership in the home. Divorce was something for the minority not the majority of families. Children grew up living with and respecting both of their parents and learned the difference between right and wrong in the home environment.

Now, through brain washing the children in school and rulings of the court, male chauvinism is considered bad. What has been the result? The obvious statistic that jumps out at you is that the vast majority of children are not raised by both of their own biological parents. Children are neglected by their single working mothers or having great psychological difficulties dealing with step parents.

Men have been “liberated” far more than women have by the removal of male chauvinism. Men are not expected by society to take a leadership role in the family. Since that is the only role nature has equipped them for, they have no role in the family. Therefore they leave! Women are trying to be the bread winners and even that role is gone from the men. What is left but to become single and go on the prowl. Men do not get married as early in life, if at all, today and women still are having babies. It doesn’t take rocket science to understand the implications of that fact. Women are having their lives ruined by single motherhood and removing male chauvinism is why.

A man will be “king of his castle.” Either it will be with a wife or without her, depending on whether or not she will support him in his kingship. Biology has dictated this. Whether you or I like it,

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

agree with it, or loath it, makes absolutely no difference. Just like the law of gravity, you may not like it but you will have to deal with it anyway.¹⁰

“THE MYTH OF THE TWO-INCOME FAMILY” (AUGUST 1997)

You often hear the passing comment, “You just need two incomes today.” This is said to bring to a close the discussion, if it ever comes up, of a woman shouldering the difficult job of home-making as a full time career. “We might as well not even discuss it, because it is not even a possibility,” is what the comment really means. It is a great discussion terminator but is it a fact?

Judging from my own personal experience, I have found it to be an out and out lie! Yes, you might have to give up some non-essentials like living in a big house or owning a few of the toys you would otherwise afford, but you get by. I have supported two sons in this fashion and my wife, who is a hard working home maker, has made our family’s life a wonderful thing to behold. While renting instead of buying, often having to settle for apartments instead of houses, and driving used cars instead of new, we knew our kids were always supervised and that they were never going to be “home alone.” They have both grown up into fine young men, the youngest leaving the nest this very year. There is no doubt that a mother at home is a giant plus for any child growing up. Taking that away from a child is not an option which a loving parent can choose.

What about the money? This is not the issue driving women out of the home. Most women burn almost all of their income on extra expenses created by the outside job. An extra car, working wardrobe, baby-sitters (whether it is called day-care, pre-school, or some other method of passing off the responsibilities of motherhood), added income taxes and extra costs for eating out more often. The mother is gone, and so is the money. (What little extra there has been created overall has been consumed by the government dipping deeper into the perceived fuller pockets, and the increase in costs by merchants who feel you can pay more for less.) When all is considered, a working mother is adding very little to the financial well being of her family.

So, why does she work? Girls and boys are exposed to a propaganda machine from the time they are born until the day they die.

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

Included in the workings of this pulp factory is the television, newspapers, magazines, school system and now even the churches. Cartoons depicting women super-heroes, as if that is what a woman should strive for, are becoming more popular all the time. The kids are told that women and men are exactly the same, with the same competitive drives, same roles in life and the same need to have a career. Day after day they are inundated with news stories of how the first woman to do this or that just did the impossible by achieving whatever thing it was that men have been doing for years or centuries. No stories of how a mother taught her son or daughter about how to deal with life. No stories of the struggling family who made it all work, while the wife was a golden success at creating a wonderful home. Instead the leader of a relatively small confused group like the National Organization of Women is interviewed to see what “women think” about an issue.

The result of all this deceitful propaganda is that boys grow up believing that women can be and should be totally self-sufficient. As men they are more likely to walk out on a family because, “Hey, this is the 90’s and women can take care of themselves!” A girl grows up thinking the same thing and then suddenly she has children and the whole facade suddenly comes down around her head. She ends up as a single mother because she believed that women are free to practice single sex without consequences, or her marriage comes apart from all the forces attacking it from this wonderful, liberated civilization of “the 90’s.” Now what? She finds that she is living on one income all by herself (or living off of her parents), and no longer has time to raise the children properly. Oh yes, the kids grow up after all but they haven’t been raised. They have no idea what a solid family even is. How can they possibly create one of their own?

That “second income” will be the most expensive money any family will ever earn.¹¹

“WOMEN, THE FOUNDATION OF CIVILIZATION” (7 AUGUST 1997)

Picture the Sears Tower in Chicago, standing in majesty, looking down upon all that surrounds it. Tall, proud and beautiful, its glass walls reflecting the sunlight in splendor. An amazing feat of engineering. Now picture that structure as its foundation is suddenly and

magically removed. What do you see? What will happen to it? The supporting members reaching up into the heart of the building, will suddenly have nothing to push against and their support will vanish. The entire tower will fall immediately. A pile of rubble will be all that is left of the glorious giant.

Women have always provided the foundational support for civilization. The edifice of our modern society would never have existed if not for the civilizing influence of women upon men. Women cause men to settle down, and to look to family and security. Women inspire men to achieve in the business world by their moral support and yes, their need to be provided for. Women have trained the boys of each generation the proper way to behave in a civilized society. The traditional role women have had historically in civilization is critical and provides the foundation for all else.

Now, remove that influence and what happens? Look around you and there you will see the answer. Feminism has pulled the foundation out from under our civilization, by convincing women that in the workforce lies their destiny instead of being wives and mothers. Men are now forced to compete with women at work instead of joining with them in a family. The house where couples live is no longer a home, where children are always cared for and supervised. Men are no longer in a position of sole bread winner and therefore do not have a known and well defined role in the family. They are leaving their families in record numbers every day. Civilization is beginning to crumble rapidly, as crime increases and neighborhoods become nothing but a collection of strangers who do not take care of each other. Children are raising themselves and learning many things from their friends, television, movies and even the Internet, that parents should be appalled at. But since the foundation of our society has been removed, the trend of the work-orphaned children continues and accelerates.

The remaining holdouts, women who are still willing to support the civilization that we all rely on, are held up to ridicule by the feminists. Fingers are pointed, pity handed out and even disgust is shown for the homemaker/housewife. They are made to feel inferior to women who have a career. They are ridiculously told that they “don’t work” because they stay at home. A homemaker works as hard or harder than any CEO does, in her job of taking care of a

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

family. She works day and night and always has another task calling for her attention. But the truth is never a guide to the feminist.

While women are busy trying to build offices in the tower of civilization, they have no awareness that they are removing the foundation of that same building. They are rearranging their office furniture in a collapsing structure, whose collapse is a result of their leaving the job of providing the foundation, for a job in the penthouse. The penthouse will soon be a pile of rubble, just like the rest of society. This is insane.

Feminists hold all women of the past in complete disregard. Until their movement came along, they believe, all women were no more than donkeys, and slaves, providing nothing but pleasure and services to men. That which was indispensable for society is trivialized by these confused ladies. With the exception of just a handful of women, who did not perform the wifely and motherly duties of their peers, the feminist views all women who lived before their movement existed as insignificant bimbos, oppressed and useless. This from a group who claims to speak for women and to have women's best interests at heart.

Contrast this, if you will, with the view of the male chauvinist, with his hated chivalry. He is said to hate women, and to want nothing but to enslave and use women. Yet what is his view of women? He views them as different than men, special and indispensable. He gives his seat to a lady and opens her door for her, OUT OF RESPECT. When he marries it is to bond for life with his chosen mate. He will do all in his power to support her, care for her and protect her. He will attempt to provide her with the best house, car and anything else that she desires. He is focused on her happiness and treasures her more than life itself. He supports her in the raising of the children, supplying the strong enforcement of the rules that she would not be able to provide without his help. He has a leadership role in the family but he confers with his wife always, and defers often to her opinion. His family is a team that is built for durability and designed to last a lifetime. He knows the critical importance of a woman's role as housewife and mother. He teaches his children to respect and honor the woman who is their mother. He looks at the women of history as wonderful, hard working and important people, who built all that we see around us by their efforts.

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

Feminists are the women haters and have only the destruction of women in their sites. The vast majority of male chauvinists love and respect women and have only these wonderful creatures' happiness as a goal. Feminism breaks families up, leaving women as single mothers struggling to get by, and in danger from the gangs of boys who have not been raised by a functional two- parent family. Male chauvinism builds strong families and provides protection, security and respect for women.

The distortion of the facts by the politically correct feminists is as common as it is disgusting. The feminist arrogance and accusatory posturing, when confronted, is a clear indication of their intellectually weak position. The way that they have been able to slander the character of all male chauvinists as well as all of the honorable, hardworking homemakers in our society ***should make all honest people angry***. The families that have been destroyed and the countless women left as single mothers because of feminist propaganda is enough to make you want to cry.

We need to start honoring the homemaker and inspiring women to take up that vital role again, or we will pay an unthinkable price. We can do quite well without female soldiers or sailors. We can do nicely without female judges, lawyers, or CEO's. But we will collapse as a civilization without dedicated homemakers and mothers. We must set our priorities back to a sane arrangement or we will suffer a horrible fate.¹²

"THE FRAGILE FEMALE" (18 AUGUST 1997)

It is a story, told to all of our little girls, that they can do anything they want in life. They can do anything a man can do. But is it true? Do women really do what a man does?

Look at what has happened since women have been given access by the courts into new areas of work. As the women have come in, the work has changed to accommodate them. Suddenly, jobs that require heavy lifting are redefined. Why is this done, if women can do the same job as a man? Every job where the definition of the job was changed because women wanted the paycheck for doing the job, is an example of a job that women could not do. We pretend that women are doing that job now, because the PC courts insist that we must in order to keep our own jobs, but people know better.

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

How many times have you heard of a sexual harassment suit in the last ten years? For that matter, how many suits have you heard about in the last 10 months? It seems that a new one occurs every day. Each one of those legal actions represents *a woman who could not take care of herself* in the workplace. She is helpless and cries out to the court to take care of her. She is too fragile to be at work, but insists on being there anyway. Things like jokes, pictures on a wall or attentions paid her by men, are all too much for her to handle. In fact it is so overwhelming for her that she must be paid 6 or 8 figures by her ex-employer to compensate for the trauma of going into the workplace. (No one seems to notice that she often will attend movies where the same jokes, even more erotic photography and a date, far more aggressive than her coworkers, are somehow dealt with. How does she do it without resort to a large settlement out of court?)

In the decades prior to feminism's rise into totalitarian proportions, gentlemen did not tell dirty jokes in mixed company, and generally, ladies would be shocked if they tried. It was an era where women were treated as fragile creatures, too delicate for men's courser natures. Today, the fragile female *denies her delicate condition*, demanding to be given the opportunity to show how tough she is. She can be a fighter pilot, astronaut or dock worker, just like any man. However, when given that chance, instead she *demand*s that the workplace treat her just like the delicate lady that she is. No dirty jokes, no advances by men, and no heavy lifting.

Companies are put into a no-win situation. They must hire women employees because the liberal courts will award money to the turned down lady if they do not. Once they do hire her, she is a walking law-suit ready to happen. She is a china doll, in a room full of bulls. Sooner or later, the company may have to pay damages because the delicate flower had a pedal creased by the facts of life at work. She then has the hypocritical gall to act like she was the offended party.

The fact that damages are awarded and working conditions are routinely modified to accommodate the lesser toughness of women, completely justifies the opinion held by all previous generations of *men and women*, that women should be **at home**, and be protected by her husband and family. Instead of this sound, reasonable opinion, based upon thousands and thousands of years of history,

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

we have the world of today where all must pretend that the emperor is wearing clothes. "Women are the same as men. This is a fact," say the thought police. They also say, "You will believe this fact, or else you will be fired, fined and ostracized!" That is not freedom. It is not even rational. It is a lie upon which we can never build, or even maintain, a strong and healthy society.

Women are too fragile to take care of themselves. Even with all of the liberal legal abuses generated in support of women (each a screaming declaration of the delicacy of our females), ladies are still harassed, abused and raped at an ever increasing rate. Our society has taken women out from under the loving care of their fathers in their youth, and their husbands in their adult years. At the same time we are rapidly destroying the social customs that provided protection for women of past generations. Now, we leave it to the overburdened court system to supply the protection for our delicate women. It is not working.¹³

"THE EQUALITY OF THE SEXES" (20 AUGUST 1997)

When the subject of equality comes up, the feminists are quick to point out that a woman can do any job a man can do. Followed closely behind this is the demand for equal pay for equal work, and a rash of temper tantrums and hysterical weeping over the "fact" that women make less than men. Judging from this bouquet of hostility one would think that women are exact replicas of men and for some strange, inexplicable reason, men have chosen, using some unknown outside force, to subjugate women to a lesser position. Of course, with the two sexes being carbon copies of each other, with no differences, this could never have happened through simple domination of the stronger over the weaker. Feminists are obsessed with convincing everyone who will listen to their "wisdom," that women are not the weaker sex. Therefore, we are at a loss to understand as to how women ever came to be in a secondary status, as is claimed to be the case.

Let us assume total equality between the sexes. Now this should mean that, with absolutely no differences between the sexes, we should just open the door to women applicants for all jobs and suddenly one half, or slightly more, of the jobs will be filled by them based upon their equal abilities. Let us test our hypothesis. We

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

should now have women staring in the NBA, or at least half of the starting positions should be filled by women. How many women play in the equal opportunity field of the National Basketball Association? Zero! What? How can this be? There are no differences between the sexes but no women can qualify to play in the NBA. Perhaps this is just a errant data point. Even though the NBA allows players of all races and from all over the world to qualify to play, perhaps they are prejudiced only against women. That must be why the WNBA was created. Let's try again.

We will next find the percentage of starting female players in Major League Baseball. Here is a sport that prides itself in breaking the color line and allowing no prejudice to block all qualified players from getting their shot. Half of the starting rosters for baseball must be women. Let's check. Zero women starting players. Hmmm. Even sitting on the bench, reserved for the second string scrub players, there are zero women. Our hypothesis is not faring too well. We check the NFL and we find that there are no women in pro football. I am not sure but I think I see a pattern developing here. How about tennis? We find that women only play against each other in tennis singles matches.

Ahhh! But wait, here we have something to back up our feminist claim: mixed doubles. Why we should call it that, when all men and women are the same is a little puzzling but let us examine it none the less. Watching a mixed doubles match is quite interesting. We see the men players hitting the ball at the opposing female players and even the females players are hitting the ball to the opposing females whenever they can. Fascinating. What can this mean? Obviously tennis players think that the female opponent is the weaker opponent and are trying to take advantage of that by hitting to the woman across the net. Well that doesn't help our hypothesis out now does it?

All sports in fact, even the Olympics, are completely segregated by sex. Women have been given chances to try out in professional sports but they have never qualified as good enough. Even the freak of nature, female super-achiever, is not good enough for men's professional sports. Obviously the hypothesis of total equality is faulty. As with all faulty hypotheses, when they are proven wrong, they must be thrown out. Women and men are different and are not carbon copies of each other.

The only logical conclusion is that women are not capable of doing certain things, as demonstrated by their poor showing in the sports world. So, to test where their abilities actually lie, let us set up standards that are the minimum requirement for a job and test all applicants to see if they can qualify. If they can, then of course they will be hired. If not then they will not be hired. This should make the feminists, who believe in total equality, quell their hostility. All should be pleased with this solution.

When we look around, we find many jobs where standards have been the norm for decades. Historically, the military, firemen and policeman have had to meet standards. What has been the feminist response to this equal opportunity to qualify in these areas? Are they overjoyed at the chance to prove their theories through actual testing against these standards? No! Instead, they have used the courts to force the standards to be lowered! This must give us pause. The NBA is allowed to maintain its standards, even though it is a totally unimportant part of our society. If standards were to be forced lower, one would think something as unimportant as a sporting event would be the place to start. The military guards our entire country from enemies who might attack us. If the military is weakened it will ultimately harm us all. The firemen are the ones upon whom we depend, in case of fire, to pull us out of harms way, even if we weigh two hundred pounds or more. If they are weakened it will put our lives in danger. The policemen have to fight the bad guys, often physically taking them on, one on one. This is critical to maintaining law and order in our communities. Certainly lowering the standards here is illogical at best.

It is quickly seen why feminists are so hostile. They believe in a mythical equality of the sexes and act accordingly. They are frustrated by reality, which runs counter to their beliefs. This breeds a confusion which results in angry name calling and application to the courts to straighten reality out. It is quite insane, but it has caught on in the United States today. Quite fashionable really.

Of course we have not even touched on the issue of children. Even when women can physically handle a physically non-demanding job, they miss more working days than men, for various reasons, but mostly because of children. Missing more work than a man, is not doing the same job as a man. So, it is not surprising that their pay is not the same. More frustration for the feminists. To real-

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

ly throw salt in the wounds of these poor deluded ladies, many women will quit their job for varying lengths of time because they get married or children are born. Since this will usually kill any serious, power career, the feminists are appalled. This is just not to be taken sitting down by these fanatics. It is time for action! But they have found, over and over again that no action is possible that will eliminate the differences between men and women. Yet they keep trying! They have tried killing the children, whom they see as the biggest obstacle to their goals. In the US, we peaked out at killing 1.5 million babies a year, and now have fallen off to killing only a couple of hundred thousand over a million babies per annum. We have over 30 million less citizens in our country today because they never had a chance to be born. (That is more people than live in our most populous state, or the entire country of Canada!) But even that drastic and heartless solution was not enough. Many babies actually survived these Herodical measures. Now what to do? Back to the courts. Let us make employers and/or the government foot the bill for the differences (a non-sequitur?) between men and women. We will force them to pay for day care, and then pretend that the births never actually happened. It's almost as good as killing the kids, because women do not have to waste any time with the little nuisances during the work day. This special treatment, we can pretend is equality.

When you base your whole existence upon a lie, things are going to be rather confusing for you, because the facts you encounter daily will not fit into your reality. You will struggle for what you think is attainable but you will fail. Feminism has failed. The portions of our society which have embraced feminism have paid a stiff price for their error. Divorce is skyrocketing and it is a rare child indeed who will be raised by both of his biological parent until he reaches his majority. There are many factors contributing to this problem but let us not ignore the prime mover in creating this condition. Feminism is not compatible with marriage and never will be. One of the two will have to go. America has embraced the insanity of feminism and her marriages are crumbling.

We need to take a step back and look at what we have done. Boys are no longer trained to treat women with respect as they once were. Feminism has caused a contempt for the role of women in our society. The protection of the family, where a woman was watched

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

over and guarded by her father and brothers, is evaporating. Husbands no longer are held responsible for protecting and supporting their wives until death parts them. Women are released early on to fend for themselves, and many of them fall victim to early pregnancy, divorce and single motherhood. This is a show-stopper for most women that it happens to. Instead of a happy life where family surround and idolize her, with a supportive husband to share life with, she now is struggling to do the simplest things in life. How can she support herself? Who will watch the kids? Where will she find the energy to enjoy life? This should not be the case! Feminism has forced this condition upon women today and the answer from the perpetrators is to demand that more feminism be forced down all our throats by the courts.

Feminism is illogical, hateful and determined to win at all costs, even at the cost of your life, community, happiness and country. This country has been turned into an asylum and the lunatics have taken over.¹⁴

"THE ODD BALL GAME" (23 AUGUST 1997)

"JOEY, YOU KNOW WHEN I WAS A KID BASEBALL wasn't like it is today," said Gramps to his 15 year old grandson. The three-dimensional presentation of the game was being played out on their living room floor, and had the same perspective for them as if they were in the stadium themselves.

"Yeah," replied Joey. "You had to watch it on that little 2-D TV screen, didn't you?" The crowd roared as the fifth batter in the line up led-off the inning with a walk.

"TV wasn't what I was referring to boy," Gramps said with a shake of his head. "TV was pretty primitive in those days to be sure, but the game was a whole lot better!"

The smell of popcorn and hot dogs was all around them as the runner took a short lead off first. Some fan was yelling support for the home team and a baby could be heard off in the distance.

"Oh, sure it was Gramps!" laughed Joey. "Everything was better in the 'good old days.' We all know that!"

The pitcher didn't bother making a throw over to first and concentrated on the next batter. The bottom half of the order never stole a base and he couldn't afford another walk.

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

“Ha, ha,” laughed Gramps without any mirth. “Back then there were 9 men on a team. All 9 of them could play ball, and most of them could hit too!”

“Even the girls?” asked Joey in disbelief. The next batter took a called fourth strike. Only one more and the pitcher would be done with this batter.

“There were no girls on the team then, that is what I am trying to tell you Joey,” said Gramps. “They had 9 men on the team and no women.”

“Why that is pure sexism Gramps! Everybody knows you got to have women on the team, its the law!” Joey couldn’t believe what he was hearing. The courts had ruled before he was born that all sports teams had to have a compliment of female players that was at least equal in relative size to the percentage of females in the population. That meant, since there were slightly more women than men in America, the baseball teams had to have five women on the field at all times. This was just common sense.

“It wasn’t the law back then!” replied Gramps with enthusiasm. “Back then you could get the best players you could afford to pay for to play on your team. Everybody played by the same rules too.” Today, the fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth and ninth batter were women. They were allowed 5 strikes before they were out, and 2 balls gave them a walk. Men were out after 3 strikes and it took 4 balls to walk them.

The batter took a swing at the next pitch and missed. No one seemed surprised, since the fifth through ninth batter nearly always made an out. There were rumors that the court was going to change the rules again and insist that only women could pitch to women to make the game more fair. They also were reviewing the practice of putting all the worst batters at the end of the lineup, since that was obviously a sexist approach.

“Wow Gramps,” Joey said shaking his head. “Things were sure sexist when you were a kid weren’t they?”

“Yes, I guess they were Joey. I guess they were.” Gramps looked at the game in progress and got up. He hadn’t really enjoyed a baseball game in years. Joey liked the home team and Gramps like to do things with him, but baseball just wasn’t baseball anymore. As he went to get a soda pop from the kitchen, he wondered how things

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

had ever come to be where they were now. Was sexism really such a bad thing?¹⁵

“THEATER OF THE ABSURD” (24 AUGUST 1997)

IF A POLITICIAN WALKED UP TO YOUR DOOR and told you that if you helped elect him, he would help pass legislation to force you to give one half of your income to your neighbor, give your house and property to the government and then rent it back for a variable fee based upon Uncle Sam’s needs, and allow the state to hire your employees for you to work in your business, what would your reaction be? You would vote for him, if you are an average American, because that is pretty much what is happening now!

I served onboard a US aircraft carrier a number of years ago, and my sleeping location was placed right between the two forward launching catapults. The first time I laid down to go to sleep I was totally surprised by the disruption that these devices caused. First the Port cat fired off, accompanied by a rush of steam, the rumble of what sounded like a giant roller coaster running right over the top of me, and then a vibration that felt just like the Jolly Green Giant had jack-knifed off a diving board built to his scale, right on the bow of the ship. Shortly thereafter, a similar set of sounds and vibrations came from the Starboard catapult. Back and forth. Back and forth. Plugging my ears did no good because the vibration shook me just as much as before. Sleep did not come easily to me that night. But I got used to it! After weeks of hearing and feeling the cats launch, I did not even notice them anymore. I fell right to sleep as if they were not there at all.

The fact is, you can get used to almost anything. Americans have gotten used to the government taking over their lives. They have been hit with absurdity so many times that they are numb to it and do not even notice it anymore.

One of the latest absurdities was the court dictating what students would be allowed into the Virginia Military Institute. Here was an all-male school that was run with a military format. But the government decided that it knew better how to run this school. Just like it did with Citadel, the government reached in and took control. This is totally absurd, but Americans have been conditioned to expect this behavior from the continually expanding government.

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

You work six months out of every year to pay your taxes. Does this seem reasonable? It is absurd! Yet Americans do this each year and continue to vote for politicians like Bill Clinton who want to take even more. This brand of politician, and there are few other brands available these days, will not be satisfied until they have your entire income, and total control of your entire life. Each month they make a little more progress in that direction. The absurdities mount, but the people are too numb to notice. They felt something was wrong, almost detecting the coming disaster, and voted in a Republican congress, but they did not quite have the picture. Bill Clinton won not only one term, but two! And when the Republicans tried to cut into the government spending, just a little bit, the people objected because they were afraid of losing their personal piece of the communistic pie.

We have created a citizenry that now embraces the absurd. For America, with its historical record of freedom and opportunity, the following items are totally absurd. If you understand the principles upon which this country was founded, you must see the absurdity of having a government that:

- Tells you who to hire in your business.
- Tells you who you must admit into your schools.
- Dictates what can be taught in schools.
- Provides a retirement plan.
- Provides a charity program for food and housing.
- Dictates who will live where, based upon the government's idea of what is right and wrong.
- Gives benefits to criminal illegal aliens.
- Has taken upon itself the role of Parent, dictating what is right and wrong in the area of moral behavior, health, and personal safety, like Big Brother, ensuring that each citizen will be a "right thinking," and "right acting," individual. (This includes, but is not limited to, affirmative action, seat belt laws, sexual harassment laws, anti-smoking laws, and motorcycle helmet laws.)
- Has, in direct violation of the constitution, attempted to disarm the law abiding citizen, while being totally unable or unwilling to disarm the criminal.
- Has been fighting a "war on drugs," that has produced no real results, except a continuing expansion of its power to intrude upon the citizen's life.

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

- Has made it illegal to defend your own property in most areas. A criminal who is robbing your house or car but is not threatening your life, cannot legally be shot. If you cannot defend your property, you do not own it!
- Does not want you to have private communications. Encryption programs are being attacked by the government because it cannot stand anyone doing anything that it cannot monitor. (How long until the “1984” bi-directional video screens will be put up in all locations where Big Brother can be better informed, so as to take even better care of you than he does today!)
- Has put pressure on all parties under its direct control to label all things traditional with a negative label, and ban them completely wherever possible. (The labels: sexist, racist, and discriminatory are used to paint unwanted activities with an extremely negative brush. The terms: diversity, inclusion, tolerance, and multicultural are used to put a positive light on the governments ideas of what is good.)

Many other items could be listed and new items appear almost on a daily basis. Our government has taken over our lives and is determining for us how we will live. It has determined that the culture of the pre-1960's was bad. It declares that the paramount beliefs of that era were sexist, bigoted, and are or should be illegal. It has determined that a business exists, not to make a profit, but instead, to be diverse. It has determined that the schools do not exist to teach reading, writing and arithmetic, but rather to teach multiculturalism, diversity and unisexuality. Our children, upon graduation, may not know how to read and write, or add up two plus two, but they can tell you all about the black struggle and the numerous cultures around the world. (What they do not teach about the black struggle is that it came to an end when Rev. Martin Luther King was killed. His positive message of working together, and giving the black man an opportunity to enter the workforce was lost. It was replaced with, the white man has oppressed the black man in the past and now owes him welfare, government programs, and jobs that he is not qualified for. Instead of black leaders inspiring the black man to grab an education and earn a great job in this land of opportunity, they “lead” by inspiring the black man into hate, frustration and a perception that there is no hope for self-help for the black race: no opportunity exists outside of the “benevolent” government. Look at

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

the inner city and see where this leadership has “led.” But this is not taught during Black History Month!)

We are now inundated with such a flood of overpowering absurdity that one is at a loss as to which direction to point in to bring it to the attention of a citizen of this country. Point in any direction and you will find absurdity. Listen to the news at night and almost nothing else comes out. We have stories of murderers who have been let out to murder again. We have stories of child rapers who are once again on the street. We have parents who have had their children taken from them because they used spanking as a discipline. We have schools that must change their enrollment criteria because the government says so. We have criminals that walk away from prosecution because they were not read their rights. We have women awarded hundreds of thousands, or millions of dollars because they were “harassed.” We have a woman awarded hundreds of thousands of dollars because she could not operate a cup of coffee that McDonald’s sold her. It goes on and on and on.

We need an UNDO button to wipe out the last 35 years and see if we cannot do a better job with a second try. Since that is not possible, America must wake up soon or the right to vote will not be weapon enough. Another revolution would be devastating and who knows what kind of mess it might produce? It is time for Americans to start fighting for their own culture, their own values, and get the government out of the charity business. We must vote, while we still can, to get rid of any politician who supports higher taxes. Period. No matter what the reason or program that is proclaimed as the justification, the politician is lying. (The government already takes in many times over what it needs to do its constitutional duty. The fact that it wastes the money on other things is certainly not justification for asking for more! This is especially true when they claim it is for something - like schools - for which we have already paid the government to provide! It is pure absurdity for them to even ask!)

I think George Orwell’s Big Brother is in our immediate future. I do not believe that Americans will wake up in time and even lift a finger to fix what is wrong with this country. There are too many things stacked up in favor of the totalitarianists. The TV is pushing the agenda of big government and liberalism with every show it airs, and Americans spend more time watching that propaganda machine than doing just about anything else. The news and schools are doing

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

the same. What forces do we have for the traditional values and family? There are a few, like Rush Limbaugh and G. Gordon Liddy, but far too few. What will it take to fix America? It will take you and anyone you can convince that we are in big trouble and that we need to act fast. I see the complete loss of freedom in my lifetime in America. Prove me wrong. Please, prove me wrong!¹⁶

“THE TEPID CENTER” (25 AUGUST 1997)

It is often proclaimed that the moderate is what we all should wish to be or become. The even, calm temperament of the middle of the road guy is believed to be what creates peace and happiness in society. When it comes to issues, he somehow always falls on the PC side of any question. He supports abortion, affirmative action, and of course feminism.

The middle of the road today is laid out on the same ground that was occupied only by the left wing radical of the 1960's. What was the middle of the road then is now considered extreme right wing. Is the middle of the road a safe place to live? Or will you simply get run over?

The moderate does not believe in anything per se. Instead he only is worried about appearances. He wants to make sure that he causes no waves. He is lukewarm and pliable at all times. A center position is always right to him, no matter what it is. An interesting quote about moderation from the Bible is:

I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth. Revelation 3:15, 16

However you feel about the Bible, you can see that moderation is not considered to be the best course of action by everyone. If you don't believe in anything, of course you will have no passion about issues, and you think anyone who does is unbalanced and foolish. The society is controlled by those who are living outside the middle of the road, and the moderate is happy to follow along like a sheep. Strong belief is baaaaaaad.

In the area of feminism, we have two groups fighting for what they believe is right. The ones who are frantically trying to save the families of America and those who are just as frantically trying to destroy them. When you realize that much of the hard-core feminist

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

doctrine comes from the same source as the lesbian agenda does, it is clear why the family is so hated, and men are not wanted to have a role. As the feminist bumper sticker says, "A woman needs a man like a fish needs a bicycle." The family supporters say, "A woman needs a man and a man needs a woman, to be complete." The moderate says, "Whatever the polls indicate."

The polls seem to be saying that fish do not need bicycles. Feminism has been packaged up to be sold to the moderate. Its proponents have created an image of moderation to mask the radical nature of their beliefs. The moderates have swallowed the image completely and as a result have given the radical feminists control of our daily lives.

In the United States today, it is illegal to be a business owner and to be anti-feminist! Just think, in "the land of the free" you can be sued for not hiring women in your business, even if you feel that your business would operate better with all men. If you do hire a woman, you must create a powder puff environment for them to work in or you will be sued. You must be careful what you say, what you do and what you put up on the walls of your business or the legal system will shut you down. Does that sound like freedom to you? Perhaps it sounds more like totalitarianism! If hiring women will give a company an advantage over a competitor, then all companies will hire women, without the courts getting involved. In the sports world, once the color line was broken, no team could afford not to hire the high quality player of a non-white race. No quota laws were required. No affirmative action laws were needed. If a company makes more money by hiring a certain type of person, then they hire that type of person. If not, then they should have the right not to hire that type of person. In a totalitarian society, the state tells you who to hire and how much to pay them. In America, obviously we are tired of freedom and want the strong hand of a totalitarian government to tell us what to think, what to do, and how we should live.

Where is Little Bo Peep when you need her?¹⁷

"THE CHRISTIAN FEMINIST AN OXYMORON" (SEPTEMBER 1997)

Christian female pastors and priests are very common today. Many feminists call themselves "Christians" and so you may be

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

taken aback at the title of this web page. If you will open your eyes and your mind, I will show you in the following articles that there is no such thing as an intellectually honest “feminist Christian” and the driving force behind the movement to ordain female church officials is not religious at all but political.

All information that we have on the life and teachings of Jesus Christ are in the Bible. One of the things that Jesus is quoted as saying is that the Old Testament was accurate and inspired down to the very punctuation (jot and tittle). So, either the Bible is a valid book, or Christianity is false. There is no other valid option. Therefore, *if* feminism is *not taught* in the Bible, and even further, *if* feminism is *contradicted* in the Bible, then there is *no intellectually honest* way that a woman could call herself, “Christian” and “feminist” at the same time. The Bible is the *only source* for Christian knowledge, and *it therefore must be accepted* in order to *be honestly a Christian believer*.

So the question is now put to the Bible: ‘Is feminism a biblical doctrine, or compatible with biblical doctrine?’¹⁸

“WHAT HAPPENED IN THE GARDEN OF EDEN?” (N.D.)

Adam and Eve were created as perfect beings without sin. They were created separately however. First, Adam was created, and later Eve was created. The Bible states:

And the Lord God said, It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet [“helper” NIV] for him. Gen 2:18

And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof; And the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man. And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man. Gen 2:21-23

According to these verses, woman was not made at the same time as man. She was instead made later for man. Her role and reason for being was to be a “*help meet*” or “*helper*” for man. This is before Eve had sinned. She was not to be a competitor with Adam

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

or to be his equal in role. She was designed and built to help Adam with his aims and desires. It must be remembered that this was in the perfect world of Eden before sin entered in. If sin had not come, Adam and Eve would still be living in Eden and Eve would still be Adam's "helper."

Next we are told that Eve sinned, and then caused Adam to sin. For this she was punished by God. After God pronounced a curse on the serpent who had deceived Eve, He continued on:

To the woman he said, I will greatly increase your pains
in childbearing; with pain you will give birth to children.
Your desire will be for your husband, and he will rule over
you." Gen 3:16

Adam was then cursed also with hard work and sweat until he died.

All three of the parties involved with the fall of mankind were punished. The snake had to crawl in the dirt, the woman had to be subservient to her husband, and the man had to work hard to get enough to eat. Some have tried to claim that this was not a command of God, a curse upon mankind, but the verses are quite clear here. God commanded that man was to rule over his wife, but he would have to work hard to support her and himself.

Now, here we have a situation where no human tradition was in place. There was no bias of hundreds or thousands of years of male dominated society influencing what transpired. We ***do not*** have ***imperfect men*** making up some rule that is slanted to suit themselves. Instead, the Old Testament, ***which Jesus proclaimed to be perfect down to the very punctuation***, states that ***God Himself*** proclaimed that a woman was to be "ruled over" by her husband at the very beginning.

God could have set any other arrangement that He wanted. He could have said to Adam, "OK, you want to follow your wife into trouble, from now on you will have to do whatever she says." Or He could have said, "From now on I want you both to think for yourselves and don't follow what the other says because we can see where that leads. Be equal." Instead, we see that biblically a male dominated society was dictated by ***God Himself*** because of Eve's sin.

The feminist of today proclaim that their lot in life has been dictated by those evil creatures called men. They even go so far as to state that the Bible was written by a bunch of men who had it in for women. To disbelieve the Bible is certainly their right but it would be **completely deceitful** to then turn around and claim to be Christian, because without the Bible, they would not even know that Christ existed, let alone what He taught.

At no point in the Bible is this male-dominated arrangement countermanded. Indeed, we find that this Eden story is referred to by Paul thousands of years later to support the rule of the Christian church that women were not to teach men in the church and that wives were to submit to their husbands. From start to finish, the Bible states that women are to be ruled over by their husbands.

Paul says:

“For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man.” [I Cor 11:8,9]

He is not stating something new or original. As we have seen, he is just restating the facts as laid out in Genesis. Woman was made as a helper to man, not the other way around. And when Paul forbids women from teaching men or having authority over men he recalls Eden, the creation of woman as man’s helper, and the fall where the woman brought sin into the world:

But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve, And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression. Notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing, if she continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety. 1 Tim 2:12-15.

Here is not some new doctrine. This is as old as the first book in the Bible. Paul is merely showing support for the command of God in Genesis 3:16. Even the reference to childbearing comes from there. The feminists who call Paul a woman hater, are pointing their fingers at the wrong source for their frustration! The Bible says that God proclaimed the role of women to be in submission to their

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

husbands way back in the Garden of Eden as the first parents were being shown the way out.

If you look at what our society has become because of rejecting this biblical doctrine (see Feminism and Divorce), you will realize that our progressive and modern view is destructive to women, even more than men.

The term Christian Feminist is an oxymoron because the Bible clearly, and repeatedly, in both New and Old Testaments, states that a woman is not to have authority over a man, nor be his equal in role. She is to be ruled over by her husband, and be submissive to him. The feminist is saying just the opposite and therefore rejects the Bible. By rejecting the Bible, she is rejecting the only source of information about Christ and His teachings. She therefore is not and cannot be a Christian.¹⁹

"THE BIBLE AND THE FEMINIST" (N.D.)

Since a Christian must look in the Bible to find what Christ taught, one, to be intellectually consistent and honest must accept the Bible as accurate in order to be a Christian. If the Bible is not accurate, and just a book written by a bunch of men who made it up to satisfy themselves, then Christianity is a fraud and you must reject it. There is no other honest alternative.

With that as our starting point, let us see what the Bible says about women, men and the church. We start with instructions written to the church in Corinth, and what the role of women was to be in church services:

Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church. 1 Corinthians 14:34,35.

Here we see that men were to be the only instructors in church, and that even if a woman had a question about what was discussed, she was to hold her question until she got home and get the answer from her husband. Her role in church was to be one of sitting quietly

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

during the service. Does this sound like there is room for women pastors, teachers or deacons?

Continuing on in the instructions to the Corinthian church, we see that the Bible states that men and women have different roles and status in relationship to the church and even the “chain of command” leading to God:

But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God. 1 Corinthians 11:3

Here is clearly stated the chain of status all the way to God. God is the head of Christ. Christ is the head of the man and the man is the head of the woman. Herein is the explanation of why women do not have a role teaching in church. The body does not teach the head. The subject does not lecture the king.

For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of man. For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man. 1 Corinthians 11:7-9

These statements strike right at the heart of feminist thought. Man is the glory of God, as the woman is the glory of man. The chain of status or command is consistent. Where is there room for a female pastor, when the woman is in subjection to the man and is to keep silent in church? It goes on to say that woman was specifically made for man. Man was not made for woman. Since this hearkens back to the very beginning, there is no room for change, modern thinking or enlightenment to modify it. Eve transgressed, and women are in subjection to their husbands. The Bible commands it, unequivocally. In Colossians it continues the same theme:

Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as it is fit in the Lord. Colossians 3:18

This is not a union of two equals. Men are not the same as women, nor do they have the same role as women. Women are to submit themselves to their husbands in the same manner as men are to

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

submit to God. This should give the “Christian Feminist” pause. There is no room here for their philosophy.

Moving on to Titus we find additional instructions on the role of women:

That they [aged women] may teach the young women to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children, To be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed. Titus 2:4,5

Note the last phrase. If a woman does not follow the role spelled out here, she is blaspheming the word of God. Blasphemy! What is the role for older women? To teach the younger women their proper role. What is the role of the younger women? To keep house! To be obedient to their own husbands and to be chaste. A female pastor is blaspheming as soon as she takes the job! Any woman who leaves her house-keeping, homemaking role to go into the workplace, and fails to be with her children and submit to her husband is committing blasphemy! According to the Bible, feminism is blasphemy.

Once again the hierarchy, or chain of status and command is spelled out in the letter to the church at Ephesus:

Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the savior of the body. Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing. Ephesians 5:22-24

Here once again women are told that they are subject to their husbands. And it is compared to the status of the church to Christ. This is not some minor difference that is subject to change with popularity of a political movement. It is set in concrete and clear. In “everything” women are subject to their own husbands. There is no room for interpretation here. There is no matter spoken to here that would be subject to change with societal fluctuations. Modern thought cannot alter the clear unchanging principles here. Modern woman and ancient woman are locked together with Eve in a permanent relationship. As it states in 1 Timothy:

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression. Notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety. 1 Timothy 2:11-15

There it is again. The reason that feminism is blasphemous, counter to the Bible and therefore incompatible with Christianity, is because it refuses to accept the biblical statement that Eve sinned and therefore all women, for all time, are in subjection to their own husbands. Whether it is the 190's or the 1990's makes absolutely no difference. BC or AD are just the same on this issue. If you accept the Bible, which you must to be an intellectually honest Christian, you must reject feminism.

Peter sums it up rather nicely:

For after this manner in the old time the holy women also, who trusted in God, adorned themselves, being in subjection unto their own husbands: Even as Sara obeyed Abraham, calling him lord: whose daughters ye are, as long as ye do well, and are not afraid with any amazement. 1 Peter 3:5, 6

Holy women, Christian women, did and will, subject themselves to their own husbands, by definition. A feminist, by definition, will never do that. A feminist can never qualify as a holy woman, a Christian in good standing. By proudly rejecting that role, she just as surely rejects Christianity, even if she won't admit it.²⁰

"THE BIBLE AND THE MALE CHAUVINIST" (N.D.)

If you have come this far, having read about the WHAT HAPPENED IN THE GARDEN OF EDEN, and FEMINISM AND THE BIBLE, you are clearly aware that the Bible is set squarely against feminism. Yet millions of women have lived their lives by the Bible's commands. In so doing they have led happy and full lives within the role defined by the Bible. They stand in stark contrast with the women who have rejected their assigned role, who have a career but are single mothers, or married many times over, often

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

with children from several fathers. The subscribers to feminist ideas struggle through life and feel empty. What is it that makes a woman of the Bible's method content and happy in her life? Her relationship with God, and a good man! The Bible has commands for the man as well as the woman and those commands are just as aggressively under attack from the feminists. What does the Bible say that a man's role is in the family. Look at this verse and see what you can see that is speaking to men:

Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church. 1 Corinthians 14:34,35.

This verse implies that the man is commanded to study and prepare as well as pay attention in the service and ensure his own understanding in order to be able to answer the questions of his wife. How can he answer her questions, which an intelligent woman will certainly have, if he is not prepared? He must actively participate in the service, or be found wanting. "Big deal!" you may be thinking. But here is highlighted where our society is breaking down. Men are seeing women as totally self-sufficient, and are washing their hands of them in the areas of protection and permanent bonding, rather than feeling that women need protection and consideration. Men are far more civilized in their behavior, they reach to much higher levels, when they are focused on taking care of their women. The old saying, "Behind every great man is a good woman!" is valid. If we want to have great men in our society we need good women behind them, inspiring them to greatness.

Next another verse which looks to be speaking to women but in reality is speaking just as much to men:

But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God. 1 Corinthians 11:3

A man is commanded to treat his wife with as much love and selfless giving as Christ has done for the church. When Christ is

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

held up as the example of being the head, a man has a tough act to emulate. Will he abuse his wife, dominate her, and make her a slave? Absolutely not! He will have her happiness in mind at all times. He will strive to provide for her wants as well as her needs and honor her always. There is no room in such a relationship for abuse or abandonment.

Now for commands directed directly at the man alone:

Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it... So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself. For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church... For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh...Nevertheless let every one of you in particular so love his wife even as himself... Ephesians 5:25, 28, 29, 31, 33

Where is there room for women hating here? I don't see it. A man is commanded to love his wife as much as if she were a part of his own body. What man goes out and beats on his body with a hammer on purpose? What man goes out and intentionally hurts himself in any way. A man guards himself against injury, and strives to avoid personal pain. He now will extend that zone of protection around his wife. If she is injured, he is injured. If she is happy, he is happy. Her wishes and desires are foremost in his mind. He leaves his parent's house and joins the rest of his life with hers. They walk a joint path and search for happiness together. Here is a biblical marriage. Here is a happy and permanent marriage.

Here also is what the feminists hate and are striving to destroy. This blissful relationship drives them crazy! The idea that a man and woman can work together so smoothly in this arrangement is impossible for them to comprehend.

In the same vein, it is stated in Colossians:

Husbands, love your wives, and be not better against them. Colossians 3:18

When a couple forgets the small things in a relationship, things can build up and bitterness is the result. When a wife does something nice for a man, he must thank her for it and let her know that it

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

is appreciated. Flowers, and other small gifts can fill his wife's heart with joy. When a man is thinking of making his wife happy, and she is thinking of making him happy, there is just no way that they will not be happy! Bitterness can never grow in a mutually giving house.

In speaking of a man seeking the office of Bishop in the church, it is commanded that he be:

One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity; (For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?) 1 Timothy 3:4, 5

Here it clearly states that a man is responsible for the things the members of his household do. He is tasked with running a tight ship and keeping his kids in line. He is not free to dump all responsibilities for the house and kids on his wife, while he goes out with the boys or even strives to excel in his career. He is responsible for what goes on at home. He sets the bounds that the children will not cross, and he is the one to deal with them if they do. He ensures that his wife is treated with honor and respect, by himself and the children. If mother says, "Wait till your father gets home," he is responsible for making his appearance that night something sufficiently memorable that mother's future role in controlling the kids is made easier during the day while he is not present.

After speaking to the wives about their responsibilities to their husbands, Peter turns to the men and says,

Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with them according to knowledge, giving honour unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life; that your prayers be not hindered. 1 Peter 3:7

Men are commanded to honor their wives and protect them. Abuse, belittlement and derision is not acceptable! In fact it says that even your prayers will be hindered if you do not treat your wife with respect and honor.

Marriage is a team effort, with both members striving for a common goal. The roles are different, just like on any team. If either member of the team is not pulling in the right direction, the whole team suffers. Whether in business, sports or marriage, each member

of the team has a role to perform. In doubles tennis, if both members of the team cover the left side, the right side is wide open, and the opponents will hit it there every time. If both cover the net, the baseline will be uncovered. When both partners in a marriage are trying to be bread winners, the kids will be left unattended. When both partners are trying to lead, nobody is following.

The roles for the marriage team have been spelled out clearly in the Bible. What it says is the complete opposite of what the feminists believe and teach. Their “enlightened” approach has led to divorce and single mothers. The Bible’s way has led to millions of happy, long-lasting marriages. For a Christian, feminism is not an option because it is anti-biblical, illogical, and a proven failure.²¹

“THE BIBLE’S DEFINITION OF THE PERFECT WOMAN” (N.D.)

Proverbs 31

¹⁰ Who can find a virtuous woman? for her price is far above rubies. ¹¹ The heart of her husband doth safely trust in her, so that he shall have no need of spoil. ¹² She will do him good and not evil all the days of her life. ¹³ She seeketh wool, and flax, and worketh willingly with her hands. ¹⁴ She is like the merchants' ships; she bringeth her food from afar. ¹⁵ She riseth also while it is yet night, and giveth meat to her household, and a portion to her maidens. ¹⁶ She considereth a field, and buyeth it: with the fruit of her hands she planteth a vineyard. ¹⁷ She girdeth her loins with strength, and strengtheneth her arms. ¹⁸ She perceiveth that her merchandise is good: her candle goeth not out by night. ¹⁹ She layeth her hands to the spindle, and her hands hold the distaff. ²⁰ She stretcheth out her hand to the poor; yea, she reacheth forth her hands to the needy. ²¹ She is not afraid of the snow for her household: for all her household are clothed with scarlet. ²² She maketh herself coverings of tapestry; her clothing is silk and purple. ²³ Her husband is known in the gates, when he sitteth among the elders of the land. ²⁴ She maketh fine linen, and selleth it; and delivereth girdles unto the merchant. ²⁵ Strength and honour are her clothing; and she shall rejoice in time to come. ²⁶ She openeth her mouth with wisdom; and in her

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

tongue is the law of kindness.²⁷ She looketh well to the ways of her household, and eateth not the bread of idleness.²⁸ Her children arise up, and call her blessed; her husband also, and he praiseth her.²⁹ Many daughters have done virtuously, but thou excellest them all.³⁰ Favour is deceitful, and beauty is vain: but a woman that feareth the LORD, she shall be praised.³¹ Give her of the fruit of her hands; and let her own works praise her in the gates.

Here you see what the perfect woman will be like. She will:

- Be a homemaker (verses 15, 18, 19)
- Keep house (verses 15, 21, 27)
- Do shopping (verses 13, 14, 16)
- Sew (verses 13, 19, 21, 22)
- Do gardening (verse 16)
- Work hard at home (verses 16-19, 22, 24, 27)
- Mind the children (verses 26, 28)
- Be a faithful wife (verses 10-12, 28-30)
- Do volunteer work (verse 20)

She does not:

- Usurp her husband's role (verse 23)
- Compete as a merchant (verse 24)
- Have a career outside of the home (verses 13-27)

The Bible defines a woman's role as a homemaker and here is where she will flourish and create praise for her name (verse 31). Here she will be more precious than any treasure (verse 1) and here is where she will be, if she wishes to follow the Bible.²²

"THE BIBLE WAS WRITTEN BY MEN (NO KIDDING!)" (N.D.)

FEMINISTS, ESPECIALLY THE ONES PRETENDING to be Christians, are always saying, "The Bible was written by men." This no-brainer statement is stupidly obvious. So, what is the point of making it?

The only reason that feminists point out the obvious in this fashion is made clear by what they hope to accomplish by doing so.

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

What they are really saying is that God did not write the Bible and it is not His word contained therein. Every time a feminist brings this up, she declares that she is not a Christian. It is an attempt to debunk Christianity!

No Christian has ever claimed that God personally wrote the Bible. Instead the claim is made that God inspired men to put down what God wanted them to. Therefore, what feminists are saying is that God did not inspire the Bible writers, and the Bible is not a holy book and it is filled with men's opinions just like all other books written by men. This is a clear declaration against Christianity, which is entirely based upon the Bible! Feminists may be atheists or followers of some other religion but they are clearly not Christians.

As I have demonstrated in my other articles, the Bible is squarely set against feminism. Why do feminists, who hate the Bible and what it teaches, pretend to be Christians? Clearly, feminists consider the Christian religion a political force that opposes them. They have declared war and are on the attack to destroy Christianity, attempting to change the religion to something that is not Christianity, and thereby removing the political force against them. Like a leaflet campaign, or an infiltration for the purpose of producing insurrection in the enemy population during a war, they are attempting to break the will of the enemy. Real Christianity cannot be convinced of the validity of feminism, therefore feminists are set on eliminating it. They have made great progress in this area.

If you believe that Christianity, or perhaps all belief in God, is nonsense, then feminism may make some points with you when they say, "The Bible was written by men." But if you are a Christian, you should be quite offended by the comment, and reject what the speaker has to say.

Feminism and Christianity are mutually exclusive. If you pick one you must reject the other. To try and pick both leads you into the realm of being a kosher ham, or a frozen flame. You are lying to yourself at least, and to the world in more likelihood.²³

"A FEMINIST'S RESPONSE" (N.D.)

Here is an email that I received from a confused feminist:

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

Nice try, but Deborah fought against the armies attacking Israel, Jael lead [sic] the army to freedom. Lydia was a businesswoman. Phoebe was a Deacon in the church. Junia was an apostle. Isaiah and Acts say that in the last days, your sons and daughters will preach. The bible says that no one operating under a spirit can say "Jesus is Lord" unless from the Holy Ghost. Many women pastors are proclaiming Jesus is Lord while performing a supernatural act, so biblically that can only come from the Holy Spirit. Unless you believe the devil is behind preaching the gospel. Wrong again!

As I have pointed out in my articles the Bible provides a wealth of commands, instructions and examples of the roles that men and women are to have. Men are clearly put forward as the leaders and women are to keep the home fires burning. From Genesis to Revelation, the attitude is consist throughout. Up against this mass of evidence for the biblical rejection of feminism, what can the feminists come up with?

Let us look at the absurd claims made in this email.

1. Deborah fought against the armies attacking Israel.

Did she? Is there a record of her lifting a sword like a man and actually fighting? No. In fact it is interesting to note how much of a male chauvinist Deborah was. When the wimpy king of Israel begged her to come along she insulted his effeminate, feministic attitude:

And Barak said unto her, If thou wilt go with me, then I will go: but if thou wilt not go with me, then I will not go. And she said, I will surely go with thee: notwithstanding the journey that thou takest shall not be for thine honour; for the LORD shall sell Sisera into the hand of a woman. And Deborah arose, and went with Barak to Kadesh. Judges 4:8,9

Deborah told Barak that the enemy would be sold into the hand of a woman. Do you get it? Men are supposed to lead, and when they are so weak as they were in the time of Deborah, where she, as a woman, would be placed in the role of a judge and leader,*

* This is the only time in all of the history contained in the Hebrew Old Testament where a female was put into this position!

then something needed to be said to the men to shake them out of their wimpy state of mind. Would a feminist make such a statement? Would a woman who felt her sex was being put down by male chauvinism, a chauvinism which had saturated the Hebrew life from its very start, proclaim that a man's honor would be taken from him because a woman would kill Sisera? Of course not. It is clear from this story that Deborah believed that a man should stand on his own two feet and women did not belong in the position of leading men.

2. Jael lead [sic] the army to freedom.

This is even farther removed from reality. Feminists will twist the truth as hard as necessary to make their point of view sound like it is normal and reality based. Was Jael a leader? Who was Jael? Let's look in Judges 4.

17. Howbeit Sisera fled away on his feet to the tent of Jael the wife of Heber the Kenite: for there was peace between Jabin the king of Hazor and the house of Heber the Kenite.

Jael was identified by her marriage. She was the "wife of Heber." The king Sisera was already on the run. He had been defeated in battle and was running for his life. He would be killed as soon as he was found. He chose to run to this area because he felt he would be on friendly turf here.

So now let us read what it is that Jael did and what her claim to fame was.

18. And Jael went out to meet Sisera, and said unto him, Turn in, my lord, turn in to me; fear not. And when he had turned in unto her into the tent, she covered him with a mantle. 19. And he said unto her, Give me, I pray thee, a little water to drink; for I am thirsty. And she opened a bottle of milk, and gave him drink, and covered him. 20. Again he said unto her, Stand in the door of the tent, and it shall be, when any man doth come and inquire of thee, and say, Is there any man here? that thou shalt say, No. 21. Then Jael Heber's wife took a nail of the tent, and took an hammer in her hand, and went softly unto him, and smote the nail into his temples, and fastened it into the ground: for he was fast asleep and weary. So he died.

That is it. She tricked him into thinking he was safe. Let him fall asleep and she drove a nail into his sleeping skull. The story was more of an insult to Sisera, as Deborah had pointed out in verse 9 above, than it was praise for Jael. She was brave for a woman but she was not a leader and did not lead the army at all, to freedom or anywhere else. The army had already defeated Sisera in battle and were in the process of chasing him down to kill him. Another feminist lie falls into the dust.

3. Lydia was a businesswoman.

Lydia is a woman whose name is mentioned in two verses of the New Testament. She is said to be a seller of cloth ("purple") in Acts 16:14. This is not an exceptional thing for a woman to do. In Proverbs (see [The Perfect Woman](#)) it states that a woman will weave and create or grow things to sell to the merchants. There is no point to be made here that is new.

In Acts 16:15 and also in verse 40 you will see why she is mentioned. She is mentioned because she was kind enough to open up her house to the disciples when they needed lodging. That's it.

4. Phoebe was a Deacon in the church.

Here is all the entire Bible says about Phoebe:

I commend unto you Phebe our sister, which is a servant of the church which is at Cenchrea: That ye receive her in the Lord, as becometh saints, and that ye assist her in whatsoever business she hath need of you: for she hath been a succourer of many, and of myself also. Romans 16:1,2

What do we know about Phoebe from the Bible? This is a letter of introduction for a woman to the church of Rome. She was a servant of the church at Cenchrea. What service she performed is unknown beyond the statement that she succored many, including Paul. This is not a woman leading the church or performing any role other than that of a traditional woman. Only a feminist would even mention her as an example of feminism in the Bible. Would Paul state in 1 Timothy 2:11 that women must be silent in church, and in Romans 16:1,2 state a woman was running a church?

Please note that whatever Paul is saying here, the only mention of Phoebe that occurs at all in the entire Bible is in this obscure

verse. *The feminist pushes aside the massive, clear and obvious evidence throughout the Bible, in order to grab with a death grip upon the scarce and the obscure, in order to fabricate something which might be pawned off as evidence.* The Bible is completely silent about even a single official function of the church ever being performed by a woman.

5. Junia was an apostle.

Once again reaching for the obscure, we have the feminists grabbing onto this verse:

Salute Andronicus and Junia, my kinsmen, and my fellowprisoners, who are of note among the apostles, who also were in Christ before me. Romans 16:7

Here Paul refers to two long time Christians by name. There is some debate as to whether Junia is male or female. Even if female there is no identification as to what is meant by the term apostle in this verse. These two may be married and many times a man and wife will be listed together under the title that the man alone holds. What role did Junia play in the church? There is no record whatsoever. If female, we must assume that it was not an official one because there is absolutely no indisputable record of any official position held in the church by any female in the entire New Testament. No action of Junia is listed here or anywhere else. To read into this verse something that would contradict the rest of the Bible, would be deceitful at best. When the feminist proclaims to the world that the church had female deacons and apostles they contradict every piece of evidence in the Bible which defines the roles of men and women. It is really quite amusing to see the blindness that feminists are eager to have towards the absurdity of their desperate position. They are quite willing to overturn everything in the Bible in order to allow their twisted point of view to survive. That is why a Christian Feminist can never truly exist.

6. Isaiah and Acts say that in the last days, your sons and daughters will preach.

You can tell the love and concern for accuracy that feminists have for the Bible. This feminist does not produce knowledge from study of the Bible, but rather from referencing some feminist quote

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

from a book. Neither of the books she cited says anything about daughters preaching. There is no verse in the entire Bible which contains the words "daughters" and "preach," or any variation of those words. Isaiah doesn't even say anything about daughters prophesying. However, in Acts and in Joel it does talk about sons and daughters prophesying. Here is what Acts 2 says:

17. And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams: 18. And on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy: 19. And I will show wonders in heaven above, and signs in the earth beneath; blood, and fire, and vapour of smoke: 20. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before that great and notable day of the Lord come:

And Joel 2:

28 And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions: 29 And also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my spirit. 30 And I will shew wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke. 31 The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and the terrible day of the LORD come.

The two biblical quotes are closely related as you can see. Note that when all of these other events happen then daughters will prophesy and not until. Also, you will note that it says absolutely nothing about women, young or old preaching! It is referring to a special situation in the very last days where the world is going to be turned on its head by natural wonders, and those from every part of the church will be prophesying. It is not speaking of the way that the church will be normally run before that intense time.

7. The bible says that no one operating under a spirit can say "Jesus is Lord" unless from the Holy Ghost. Many women pastors

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

are proclaiming Jesus is Lord while performing a supernatural act, so biblically that can only come from the Holy Spirit. Unless you believe the devil is behind preaching the gospel. Wrong again!

Here is a real proof for you. We are supposed to accept the statement as fact that there are many women "pastors" performing supernatural acts. Why are we supposed to believe that? Because the feminists say so. Great reasoning. We only have to remember that Joseph Smith, and many others have made similar claims for themselves.

When the Bible clearly points out that women have a certain role, and feminists proclaim that role is a sham and demeaning, can there be any doubt as to what the feminist's true feeling is for the Bible and its message? It is impossible for someone who feels that way about the Bible, who places their own ideas so far over what the Bible teaches, to be a servant of the God of the Bible. Christianity and feminism are mutually exclusive concepts and the only reason feminists are interested in being viewed as Christians is to destroy the foundation of that great source of opposition to their movement, from the inside. Their efforts have been surprisingly effective. There are a large number of churches which have given up the Bible in favor of the feminist doctrine, installed woman into the role of "pastor," and thereby moved out of the Christian community.²⁴

"YOU POOR FOOL!" (N.D.)

A poor angry feminist began an email addressed to me with those very words. She later promised to pray for my "misguided soul." Perhaps it is her own soul that is in danger! Here I quote Jesus:

But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: ***but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire.*** Matthew 5:22

Isn't it interesting how the truth brings such anger out in people? The clear statements from the Bible which I used in my articles can-

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

not be refuted or even legitimately argued against, so feminists must turn to name calling, even the so called Christian ones. The Bible rejects feminism to begin with, so I suppose its condemnation of calling someone a fool will fall on deaf feminist ears. Here is a fine example of a feminist who is not a Christian, but is claiming to be.

I thank you madam for providing yet another piece of evidence in support of my position.²⁵

"FEMINISTS AND FREEDOM" (11 OCTOBER 1997)

A recent e-mail posed a question to me about freedom. I think that it is important to differentiate between two kinds of freedom. The first is good and desirable: freedom from government interference in our daily lives. The second is bad and should be avoided: freedom from personal responsibility. When the word "freedom" is recklessly thrown about, without differentiating between these two, many dangerous and foolish concepts can appear to be good and merely in support of that which is dear to the hearts of all Americans.

This web page is focused on the failed and dangerous cause of feminism. How do these two types of freedom come into play in the area of feminism?

Freedom from government interference in our daily lives is under attack by the feminist movement!

The government is at war with Parents who wish to teach their children that a mother belongs at home and a father must support his family! The public schools, by direction of the government, will attack these parents' position with all of their power. A teacher would be fired if he were so bold as to even suggest that a young girl might find a happy and worthwhile life as a homemaker, because the government has determined that freedom of thought is only applicable, in American schools, if it is Politically Correct thought. There can be no greater intrusion upon a citizen's rights than to take his children and brainwash them with doctrines of the state that run counter to his own beliefs! Let me repeat that. There can be no greater intrusion upon a citizen's rights than to take his

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

children and brainwash them with doctrines of the state that run counter to his own beliefs!

If a private citizen wishes to start up a business today, he is suddenly without freedom to choose whom he will hire in his business. This absurd situation has come about through the recent activities of our ever expanding government, and the activities of the feminist movement. Our constitutional freedom is rapidly evaporating because of the governmental support for, and enforcement of, Politically Correct thinking. If you do not worship at the fountain of Politically Correct Thought, you will feel the weight of the government upon your neck!

If that citizen, instead of creating his own company, chooses to go to work for another company, he will find that his opinions and actions must be politically correct also. This is not because the company is necessarily in support of politically correct activities but it has set its PC policies because our government has opened the door to legal abuse of any company which does not follow the PC line. The strong arm tactics of the government has turned all of American companies into little PC robots in the area of Human Relations policy.

Over a certain area of our lives, the government has take totalitarian control. That area is expanding each day. Like a hose pouring out water onto a rug, the area of contamination is spreading ever wider. The people in government have determined that they know better than you do how to run your own life. They have decided whether or not you should smoke, wear your seat belt, or support PC causes. In the area of personal freedom, they are stealing from you with each step that they take, just as surely as if they had put a gun in your face and demanded your wallet. (The IRS is doing that too, literally, at the same time!)

Freedom from personal responsibility is constantly supported by the feminist movement!

While the PC crowd does everything in their power to seize control of your freedoms by use of our government, at the very same time they are proclaiming a glorious day of release from personal responsibility for all citizens. We are told that feminists are in support of freedom for women, at the same time they are picking all

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

women's pockets through taxes to support their useless programs. What freedoms are they really in support of?

1. The freedom for women to have sex without any consequences. In spite of the fact that single-mothers abound and are having their lives turned upside down because of it, this "freedom" is proclaimed by the feminists.
2. The freedom for women to kill their children. Abortion is the murder of a child, who most often is a female, in order to free a woman from the responsibilities of her own actions. (Rape and incest are not even a blip on the screen of the total number of abortions. To even mention those rare exceptions is nothing but dishonest misdirection by the feminists.)
3. The freedom for women to abandon their children to day care centers and other locations, in order to pursue a career. This frees the mother up from the critical task of raising the next generation and guarantees that soon our society will collapse.
4. The freedom for men to abandon their role of bread winner and thereby ensure that men will only be a short-term visitor in the home. The huge majority of children today are not raised by both of their real parents. It has been clearly demonstrated that children who are not raised by their own biological parents are far more likely to be abused in every way.

It is time for a reality check!

It appears that those of the feminist movement labor under the misconception that all of life is but a search for personal ego fulfillment and gratification. Job, family and all other things are to take a back seat to personal happiness. That approach to life is what is pulling this country down. If the hard things, like being a mother and father, raising children and supporting a family are less important than your personal gratification and fulfillment, then we might as well call the whole thing off right now and close the country down for lack of interest.

The feminists are forever belly aching that all women are not cut out to be homemakers. Are all men cut out to work a job and support a family? Of course not! But life is hard, and you do what you have to do. A sense of duty gets a man out of bed every morning

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

and out the door to work, even though he is not fulfilled by going to work. It is patently absurd to demand that everyone who supports society by doing the right thing must be fulfilled by doing it! If the plain ordinary unselfish act of being what your family needs you to be is too much trouble, you are not worth the space that you are taking up on the planet.

Take a look around you. Most men do not have a career at all but rather a job that they perform to support their families. Men have chosen those jobs based upon what job is available and whether or not it will provide the money their families need. Being fulfilled was seldom the major consideration. Aptitude was required or he would not get paid for doing a job but that was as far as it went.

Here is the point that is too often missed: long term, without families no one is going to be safe and no one is going to have freedom of any sort. Feminists mistakenly believe that women can cast off their responsibilities of being wives and mothers and live off of society without contributing to it in the important area of raising the next generation.

We have a duty to society to raise the next generation. If a woman sidesteps her duty, leaving it to another, then she is creating a drag on our civilization. If a man leaves his family and does not support them, then he is creating a drag on our civilization. What the feminists have done is to say that no one has responsibilities any more. Men and women are exactly the same in role, and the children are of no concern. Men do not need to support their families and women do not need to raise their children. Marriage is passé and adultery is not a big deal. They have destroyed the arrangement which produced continuity of morals and societal conscience: that which perpetuates our society and culture.

“Let us, before we die, gather up our heritage, and offer it to our children.” Will Durant.²⁶

“A WOMAN’S RIGHT TO CHOOSE” (NOVEMBER 1997)

DOES A WOMAN HAVE A RIGHT TO CHOOSE? Of course. She can choose what to eat each day. This is a choice and she has a right to make a decision as to what that choice is to be. No individual that I know of opposes this right. Therefore, it appears to be without opposition that a woman has a right to choose. The title phrase

of course is too ambiguous to have any meaning worth getting into large scale debates over. It is an incomplete statement, in that it has no object or qualification as to what she might be choosing.

If the title of the article were rephrased thusly, “A woman's right to choose to do anything at all she desires,” then the assertion is patently false. A woman may not legally rob, assault or extort. This is not contested by even the most radical feminist to my knowledge. Once again we are left without anything to discuss.

So far we have established that a woman has a legal right to choose certain things, but not all things. So, what is the limiting factor in her right to choose? When her choice will harm another person, physically, financially and sometimes emotionally, the law stops her from doing so.

Let us take an example. A woman delivers a baby after eight months of pregnancy. She is unmarried, young, and without financial support. She decides that she doesn't want this baby in her life. She wishes that it had never existed because of the problems that it brings along with its presence. She reasons that this child will grow up unloved and despised. No child should have to go through that. It might be molested by a boyfriend of hers or end up on drugs or in a gang. She decides that the only humane thing to do is to terminate the life of the child. She takes out a large kitchen cutting utensil and proceeds to separate her child into smaller pieces for ease of disposal. She has exercised her ability to choose but not her right to choose. She has no legal right to kill her child. In fact she is guilty of murder, and can be prosecuted for that crime. The newspapers, child rights advocates and other like minded groups join their voices together with the religious right, and like minded groups in outrage that such an atrocity has occurred. Liberal talk show hosts, join their voices together with the conservative talk show hosts in denouncing this woman's actions. All agree that this is an outrage.

Now, take a second example. A woman, also very young, has carried a fetus for eight months. It has developed to the exact same point as the child in the first example. This woman decides that for the same reasons as those listed in the first example, she is going to hire a doctor to do exactly the same thing to her child as the mother did in the first example. The doctor lays her on a table, and proceeds to segment the body parts of the baby into separate pieces for easy extraction. The child dies a rather unpleasant death. Suddenly the

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

reactions of the general population is no longer uniform. Now we have the country divided into two hostile camps. Now the liberal and the conservative disagree about the morality and ethical nature of the act. The conservative reaction is consistent. He is outraged by the brutal murder of a baby. The liberal suddenly sees no problem with the act.

Here we have a clear demarcation between the anti-abortionists and the pro-abortionists. Consistency would dictate that if one of the above acts is a crime, so is the other. It takes a mental effort of huge proportions to see any significant difference between the results of the two acts in the two examples. In both cases a child dies. In both cases a mother is freed from the responsibilities of mothering a child. In both cases the child will not grow up in a neglected environment. In both cases the child was equally well developed physically and mentally. The only difference is not significant to the child, it either has or has not moved a few inches outside the wall of mother's abdomen. The two children are of equal intrinsic value and are an equal loss to humanity.

Does a woman have a right to choose to end the life of her baby? If people believe this, then they are hypocritical if outraged by mothers who drown, smother, or neglect their children to death, because it is a woman's right to choose what is done with her baby's life. They have no grounds for outrage about a woman exercising her right to choose.²⁷

"THE JOY OF SEXISM" (2 NOVEMBER 1997)

Actually, you are probably a devout sexist, no matter what your stand is on feminism. (The fact that such a nomenclature can be attached to a movement is proof of that!) A sexist attitude is one which is based upon a belief that there are real differences between the sexes. If you do not believe that there are real and significant differences between men and women, then you are sufficiently out of touch with reality as to qualify as a member in good standing of the National Organization of Women, whose membership is actually very small and they could really use your support.

If, on the other hand, you have a grasp of the obvious and an understanding of the plain and simple facts of life, you should be able to stand in full support of the sexist point of view for the following:

- Sexism demands that because a male is stronger and tougher than a female, he therefore should never hit her. A boy on a playground or a man in his home should never beat up on a member of the weaker sex. Why? Because a woman is not capable of defending herself against a man in a fair fight. Agreed?
- Sexism requires that a woman should never be required to lift objects that only a man is strong enough to lift, whether in the home or the workplace. Common sense, right?
- Sexism unequivocally states that only women give birth to children, and have breasts for nursing babies, and are emotionally equipped to provide the nurturing that young children require for healthy development. A pair of open eyes will convince anyone, even a casual observer, of these basic facts.
- Sexism believes that men are more aggressive than women are. Anyone who has gone to school will have seen that the boys get into most of the fights and instigate most of the activities that require an aggressive attitude. As children grow up, it is a simple fact that the vast majority of aggressive crimes are perpetrated by males. Even when women do commit aggressive crimes, they usually are led into it by a man. Again sexism has merely accepted a solid fact as being valid.
- Sexism accepts the **historical application** of these facts of life **in producing the traditional roles** of men and women in society. By accepting the previous facts as valid, sexism rejects as completely absurd the idea of casting them aside to support non-traditional roles for men and women, and then *to expect the facts of life to suddenly change* sufficiently to allow the new arrangement to produce acceptable results.

Sexism is based upon observation, logic and tradition. For thousands of years, sexism has been the *nearly unanimous* view of the citizens of all the cultures around the world. It is sound, workable and reasonable, producing the greatest opportunity for any society to offer happiness, security, and stability of family, neighborhood, and nation.

We have seen the results in our society as we have attacked, vilified, and illegalize sexism. Families are falling apart, and our society is destabilizing. Shall we pull our collective heads out of the sand and have a look around before it is too late?²⁸

An age old adage in our culture is, "Ladies first." Where did this come from? Was it an attempt by men to push women down and keep them in their place? Was it an attempt to make women appear weak and less important than men? I am sure that feminists think so but, as is usually the case, they do not have a clue as to what reality is.

"Ladies first" was an attempt by men to protect women, in a world where the simple fact is that women cannot protect themselves! I consider this a good and noble thing. If boys were not trained to allow ladies to go first and instead determined the order of preference by "the stronger goes first" as they do amongst themselves, women would always go last and be forced to the back of any line. The weakness of women would be an insurmountable obstacle in life and their position would be only that of a lesser human.

It was the training of, "Ladies first" that men received as boys, which made it possible for women to demand and receive suffrage. Feminism would have been laughed out of existence if men did not wish to protect women and have a desire to give to women that which they couldn't earn for themselves.

It is ironic indeed that the very feminists, who were the beneficiaries of the philosophy of "Ladies first," have launched such vicious attacks upon that very philosophy! Feminists feel that now that they have walked through the door of preferential treatment, they wish to slam it closed and claim that it either never existed, or that it was a bad thing. Such stupidity from otherwise intelligent people could only be caused by adherence to a flawed and bankrupt ideology.

The most paradoxical aspect of feminism is that it is still riding the back of "Ladies first," even as it condemns it! If men suddenly decided to do away with preferential treatment for women, how would women continue to pretend to be equals with men? If the vote were removed from women today, could they mass a revolt and take it back? Not in this lifetime. If they were made slaves, having all of their rights as citizens revoked, what could they do about it? Nothing! Think of the reverse. What if women tried to take the vote away from men and revoke their rights? The country would be overthrown in a day by the men!

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

“Ladies first” is necessary for the feminists to play their game of “Let’s pretend that we are men.” So, next time you hear one of the fanatical feminists pontificating on how horrible the male chauvinists are, and how terrible it is for a woman to be placed upon a pedestal, just remember that it was the pedestal, created by the male chauvinist, which allowed her the freedom to make such a silly spectacle of herself!²⁹

“WHAT WOMEN WANT” (30 NOVEMBER 1997)

The number of women, even women who thought that they would disagree with what is on this page, who have come to *The Chauvinist Corner* and found here an opinion that they can agree with has been quite a demonstration of the truth of what is written here! The arrogance and bone-headed stupidity of the feminist is just not to be believed! There is no concern in the feminist for what women want. The feminist, as is the case with all liberals, thinks that she knows best how you should live your life! You are too stupid to figure out how to do things, so she is going to tell you what is best for you. If you are not outraged by that fact, you should be! Feminists have the US government dictating to the American people what they should think in the area of feminism and that is just plain wrong.

The average American woman would be overjoyed to be able to find a man that will take care of her, be faithful to her, and be there for the children that they have together. A man that will support, love and respect a woman, is all that is required to make the average woman happy. Women are not naturally driven to compete in sports or the workplace like men are. Today, they are being told that they are competitive. They are told in school, in movies and in high priced advertising on TV but experience has proven that, while women are not afraid of hard work, and enjoy playing sports, the large majority of them are completely at a loss to understand the male need to compete and the need to win. It is a deep seated, fundamental difference between the sexes that feminism denies.

Look around you and see if you can find any official government support for training children how to live in a traditional family. Where is the driving force to be found in support of teaching boys how to be men? Men who will be the head of the household? Men

who will not divorce their wives? Men who will always earn a paycheck and pay the bills for the family? Men who will remain in the same family that they have fathered their children in, until death? Where is the official driving force to be found in support of teaching girls how to be women? Women who will be at home when the children are? Women who will remain faithful throughout their lives to their one husband? Women who can and will keep an orderly house? Women who can cook, balance a checkbook and manage a household budget?

If you look closely at the influences on children today, you will note that training for being a member of a traditional, lifetime family, is not only absent, the whole concept is attacked! Almost every email that I have received that has attacked this web page has come from the academic circles! What does that tell you about what your children are being taught by their teachers?

Marriage is the single most important voluntary event in life. Marriage is not just an arrangement that legitimizes sex and children. It is not just a simple sharing of a house or a bed. Marriage is a lifetime commitment, for better or for worse, where a man and a woman are joined together until death. Every event and activity of a husband and wife, from their wedding day on, is connected to their marriage in some fashion. All successes and failures. All joys and sorrows. All glorious and all tragic things that happen are a part of the marriage and all are joined and shared by the husband and the wife.

The dirty little secret of the feminists is that they hate marriage. The lesbian leadership of the National Organization of Women is absolutely disgusted by the traditional marriage and the idea that a man and woman can live a lifetime of happiness without the federal government dictating how to do it. A woman who is a wonderful homemaker, who supervises her children, and spends large amounts of time every day raising, nurturing and playing games with her children, is considered a total failure, an unfulfilled slave by these feminists. There are not words strong enough to describe how twisted that is.

Three of the things that women want are:

- Security. A man who will provide a home, food, and a safe environment for her and her children.

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

- Love. A man who will put her happiness first, caring for her needs, emotional and physical. A man who will be with her for life, and never fade away from his desire to make her happy.
- Respect. She wants to be feel that what she does is important and appreciated. She wants her opinion to carry weight and to be treated with dignity.

If these are provided by a man, he will not be married to a feminist! The feminist's sickness can enter into a relationship when a man is failing to support his family, or is abusive, and removes the security from his wife. Another avenue is if he fails to keep the romance and love alive in their marriage. Lastly, he can create a fertile ground for the feminist lies by taking his wife for granted, treating her as a piece of furniture, or acting as if he disregards her status as an important human being.

Because many men of the past failed in their roles, feminists found a foothold in our society. Their "cure" was worse than the disease! Instead of making marriage impossible to maintain by introducing the insanity of feminism into our culture, we should have, (and still should!) correct the real problem and train up our boys to be good husbands and fathers! The problem would be solved and our society would flourish if we did this. As it is, we are heading for a chaotic, and dangerous future, where women and children are going to suffer in greater numbers with each year that passes.

It is our choice. We can start raising real men, who are good husbands and fathers, along with real women who are good home-making wives and mothers, or we can continue to delude ourselves and the next generation that single mothers are just as good as two parent families and that men can move from woman to woman, fathering children but not raising them. The way is clear, and easy to see. It is time for action!³⁰

"REAL MEN: THE NEED FOR MASCULINITY" (DECEMBER 1997)

As our society has become more progressive, we have made every effort to eliminate the masculine from the picture. Real men are becoming harder to find, as the Political Correctness movement has launched an all out effort against them.

What are the qualities of a real man that the feminists hate so much? Here are a few of them:

- A real man does not do housework because it is women's work. Sure, when the wife is ill or an emergency comes up, a real man will lend a hand but generally a real man has a real woman to do his housework for them both.
- A real man supports his family. His wife does not earn a paycheck, but she spends most of his! His family is financially supported by his efforts. He will do whatever it takes to keep a roof over the heads of his family and ensure that they have plenty to eat.
- A real man does not leave his wife for another woman, ever! He is true to his marriage vows and will do whatever it takes to hold his marriage together. He will treasure his wife and treat her like the special creature that she is. His world is his wife and family.
- A real man is a solid father. He teaches his children manners, and ethics. His children are taught to mind and be concerned about other people's feelings and property. You want his children to be the kids next door to your house.
- A real man is the king of his house. He has the final word on major decisions. He is very concerned about the happiness of all of the members of his house and does not make decisions that will emotionally harm any of them. His decisions are based upon the all of the needs of his family: emotional; moral; and financial. His reign is kind and merciful. The subjects of his rule are proud of their position, and not embittered by their role.
- A real man is a gentleman. He is not rude, or thoughtless of others. He is firm but not hostile. He is honorable and honest. If you break down on the road, you want a real man to stop and help you. If your daughter is getting married, you know that she will have a secure, honorable and happy life if she marries a real man. Your grandchildren will be well mannered and happy if their father is a real man.

Yes, this is the individual that the feminists hate. Here is the focus of all their hostility. They have done everything in their power to train boys in school, and anywhere else they have influence, that being a real man is evil and to be avoided. Instead boys are directed towards being effeminate. Feminists want men who cry and are sen-

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

sitive, who are willing to let a woman run things. If they had their way all little boys would be dressed in skirts and little girls would wear the blue jeans.

It will never happen exactly that way, because it is biologically programmed into males to be masculine and into females to be feminine. However, what feminism has been able to do is destroy the training that boys used to receive, and instead of real men, they are becoming real animals, chasing sexual encounters and more toys, instead of the things that create a stable society and long term families.

What we are in dire need of in this country are more real men, and the real women who will join with them to create a solid society!³¹

"SELF DELUSION AND THE FEMINIST" (10 DECEMBER 1997)

Ever notice, how that a woman entering a working environment, can never fit in as it is? She feels that it is her right to change it around so she can feel "comfortable," and damn the comfort of all those around her. If men enjoy having pictures of women on the walls of their offices, in their lockers or on calendars, these women think that they have the right to object and have the pictures and even the men removed from the job. This is called "fairness" and "equality." If men find pictures of flowers, kittens or whatever feminine nonsense finds its way onto her walls, objectionable, in poor taste or just plain stupid, nothing can be said, or at least listened to. Equality has seldom been more unequal.

Specifically, women are afraid of pictures of other women in sexy outfits or unclothed altogether. What is it that they fear? That men will view them as sex objects if those pictures are seen, and the working place suddenly becomes "hostile." The absurdity of this point of view is so blatant that one must laugh at the stupidity! (If a naked female form is really frightening to a woman, she would faint every time that she took a shower!) Men view women as sex objects anyway! The pictures do not change that one way or another. After generations of men fighting over women and spending their most strenuous efforts trying to impress women, in order to be able to take them to the bedroom, feminists have the insane belief that men can change and suddenly not look at women that way anymore.

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

I imagine you have seen, just as I have, a woman sitting there in a short skirt, legs crossed and displaying all but a very small portion of her lower extremities for all the world to see, complaining about the sexist attitudes of men. Is she so stupid as to not realize her hypocrisy? Does she think that men will view her as a non-sexual object, a serious business participant? No woman could grow up in our culture and not realize that men look at a woman dressed like that with the bedroom, not the boardroom, on their minds. Yet they persist in pretending that their position is reasonable and valid.

Feminists believe that women can go on controlling men sexually and then at the same time be seen as equals and treated the same as men. It is an impossible scenario that is doomed to fail. The special privileges that go along with womanhood, came from men who did not view women as equals but rather as creatures that warranted special treatment because they could not fend for themselves in the world of men. As long as it is considered more of an offense to perpetrate violence upon a woman than it is a man, women are not equal. If a man insults another man, the offended party can have satisfaction by asking the offender outside to settle it. If a woman insults a man, he is supposed to take it because she could not defend herself in a fair fight. The interaction between the sexes will never be one of equal to equal. It will be either, men dominating women because of men's physical strength and aggressive personalities or one where women receive special treatment in order to protect them from their frailties. This is basic to the human race and can never change.

This is especially evident in the ruse used today by the feminist propaganda machine. Women are classified as a minority! It is a fact in the United States and every other country on earth, that there are more women than there are men. That, by definition, is a majority, and only a mind warped by a sick ideology could twist that into being a minority. How can anyone ever be treated as an equal, who claims minority status when they are in the majority? How many women does it take to equal one man in the eyes of those who claim women are a minority? What clearer statement could be made that men and women are not equal, even in the eyes of the feminists?³²

"BABES IN FILM LAND" (16 DECEMBER 1997)

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

Anyone who has paid attention to the drivel that comes out of Hollywood at all over the last few years simply must laugh at their confusion. For example, the movie *Striptease* with Demi Moore in the lead role, had one of the most inane scenes of any movie ever made. Here was Demi, playing the part of a stripper, working in a place where women take off all of their clothes and dance in as provocative a fashion as possible, selling sexual fantasies for dollar tips, confronting the manager of the club and complaining that the napkins used by the club, displaying the club logo were demeaning to women. The disconnected chain of reasoning behind that confrontation places the whole love affair that Hollywood has with both feminism and the naked female body into stark clarity.

Hollywood visually states in nearly every movie that women are sexual objects, to be won and bedded as often as possible. Men are portrayed as being totally out of control over women and possessed with an irresistible obsession with having sex with them. This has been a standard tactic of movie makers right from the start. It is tried and true, and brings in the money, because men in the audience very much enjoy seeing the actresses taking off their clothes and strutting their sexuality before them. It is the same thing that allows strippers to bring in big money from tips for doing the same thing in person. It is what prostitution is: sex for money and no attachments required. Hollywood is pimping for its actresses.

While Hollywood is selling women's bodies on the screen, it is at the same time trying as hard as it can to promote feminism. This is quite insane but there you have it. Even the movie *Men in Black*, lost track of its own title and just had to insert a woman into the corps of men, who wore black. (This was of course after they had the same woman strutting around in a short skirt for most of the movie and the director had her waving her bare legs around while hanging from a tree limb while wearing the skirt.) Try and find a movie or TV show today that does not have many clear statements of support for feminism. What cop show will have only a man or pair of men, working a case today? Real life has that but not television shows.

It used to be only sex appeal, voyeur pimping, that motivated Hollywood. *The Journey to the Center of the Earth*, created a female character in it to travel with the men to the center of the Earth. She served no purpose but to generate sexual situations amongst the

men. The original book never had a woman in the traveling group! This movie was back in the 1950's. Now we have the fanatical celluloid dealers creating female starship captains and macho jungle fighters. In most cases the pimping is done on the side (witness Xena) with skimpy outfits for the women, but the female macho myth is being promoted at full tilt boogie!

Once again enter Demi Moore. She was cast in the role of a female SEAL. I imagine that the vast majority of people in the audience of *GI JANE* were ignorant of the SEALs and the standards which must be met to become a member. When male sailors enter boot camp, they are given the opportunity to try out for the SEALs. Only the most physically fit and capable normally even go to the tryout. Most of even that top of the line group fail to qualify for a billet in the SEALs school. Then when the ones who qualify for school go there, most of them drop out the first week. Only the top of the top males can make it through to becoming a SEAL and there has never been a woman born on this planet that could even come close. And yet, we have the dainty, small boned, Demi Moore pretending to be a SEAL, and getting huge bucks for pretending the impossible. Hollywood is indeed crazy.

This would be unimportant if people did not have their point of view shaped and warped by the nonsense that they see on the screen. We have lowered the standards of our military to allow women to serve. We have done the same for the fire and police departments. We have forced the government to hire and promote women at a ridiculous rate, and are trying to do the same to private companies, if there is such a thing anymore. All the while Hollywood has forgotten the women who stay at home and have a happy marriage! It is hard to find the happy homemaker scenario in a movie or television show today. Instead the "powerful" woman, the woman who leaves her kids for her career, the woman who breaks new ground over the same old ground that men have been going over for centuries, is the focus of the movies and television shows of today.

To Hollywood, any role other than housewife, is proper for the actress in a movie. The role of housewife is only allowed in a movie as long as the starlet kills, leaves, or at least cheats on, her husband. Of course the husband is always a mean spirited, abusive good-for-nothing. How much of this one-sided, mythological, phony non-

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

sense can the American people take? A lot apparently, because they keep coming back for more. Living in a fantasy world is in vogue these days.

There is no real doubt that much of the support for feminism in laws and company decisions would never have occurred if it were not for the misguided brainwashing that the American people have received from Hollywood. The brainwashing continues and feminism continues to survive. Feminism is made possible by the good hearted, tolerant culture that feminism is destroying with its very existence. Families are not compatible with feminism and our culture is not compatible with broken families. Hollywood is making big money from its pimping, and therefore can continue to do its brainwashing.

It is a sad commentary on the intellectual atrophy of the American mind that we have given up so much for so little.³³

"FEMINISM A VIRTUAL REALITY" (18 DECEMBER 1997)

What is a virtual reality? A computer produces images that simulate a real world, which exists only within the computer. Sensors attached to a human tell the computer in which direction a human wishes to look and move and images are created that display an appropriate area of the pseudo world. The "virtual world" of course does not really exist and the whole process is merely make-believe but it closely resembles the feminist movement and their associated philosophy!

What are the factors which make this simulation possible? What is playing the role of the computer and virtual reality display which allow the feminist to continue to live in her deluded world? A number of factors are required, any one of which, if removed, would shut down the simulation and shatter their pseudo world.

1. Men have to continue to agree to let feminists pretend to be equal in role. If at any time men decided that they were through playing "let's pretend" with the feminists, the whole simulated structure that the feminists have so carefully constructed, would be torn down overnight. Women would no longer have any chance of playing at being men, and they would only have the opportunity of doing what men allowed them to do. This may seem unlikely today,

but at any moment in future time it is possible. The more time that passes will move it from possible, to probable, to inevitable.

2. Our mechanized society must continue to flourish. Look at the noble savage, the American Indian. The liberals of today sing the praises of the Indian culture which lived off the land and was not mechanized. Yet the feminist would find herself a slave in that culture. Women today could never have competed for the roles of men, if the efforts of men of the past had not created machines to make life easier to lead. Women for thousands of years have been taken care of by men, and now when men have finally created a life for everyone that is much easier and filled with more leisure, feminists want to cash in on that accomplishment and claim it for their own. If at any given time our modern society was shaken or destroyed, by war, plague or environmentalist extremists, men out of a sense of self preservation, and the preservation of their families, would push the feminist aside to hammer out a situation where survival would take the lead in the priority list and intellectual tidily winks like feminism would die instantly.

3. A stable society must continue to exist. Women cannot protect themselves from men. Law enforcement has currently replaced husbands and male family members as the protector of women for the feminists. Of course we have all been appalled at how useless law enforcement really is when a man takes it insanely into his head to abuse or kill a woman, but feminists are counting on the government to replace men in the area of providing them with the protection that they require. As society continues to deteriorate into chaos, because parents no longer stay together to raise their children, the protection of the government will be spread thinner and thinner. It will reach the point where chaos is so threatening that freedom will be forced from our land. Ultimately that will lead to revolt, and feminism will not have any chance of surviving the process.

4. The moral atmosphere of tolerance must not slacken. Looking back at history, we see that women have been nothing more than property on many occasions. They have had limited rights and could not even own property during much of the past. If a change in the political climate should occur, where a religious fervor, or other philosophical driving force, should move men from the "it's okay" to the "it's not okay" point of view on feminism, the movement

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

would be crushed, just as feminism has always been crushed in the past.

Feminism has reared its ugly head on numerous occasions in history. Ancient Greece and Rome had their feminists as have other cultures in decline. This time we are told the simulation is for real but alas, while we may debate whether feminism is the cause of a society's decline, or merely a symptom of it, the fact is, *when men become so passive as to let the women take over, their society is ready to be laid to rest.*³⁴

"BASEBALL AND EQUALITY" (26 DECEMBER 1997)

WHEN THE COLOR LINE WAS BROKEN IN MAJOR LEAGUE baseball an interesting thing happened. Over a very few years suddenly teams were filled with black athletes. Why? Because they could play baseball very well! Teams took the best players, regardless of color because it helped their teams. It would hurt their chances of winning a pennant to exclude the black man from their roster. There is no need for a law to force baseball teams to use the talents of minority players because the minority players are good enough to win a spot on the team in a fair competition against all comers.

When the blacks entered baseball, they did not demand special treatment or expect the baseball world to change its normal mode of operation to make it "comfortable" for them. In fact they had to go through some pretty rough times while people got used to the idea of a black man in a Dodger uniform. It was hard but it was worth it and today, all-white baseball is just a part of history to be forever left behind. All of the professional sports have learned that it is in their own best interest to hire minorities.

Contrast that if you will, with the concept of affirmative action. Here we have laws in place that discriminate in favor of minorities and women when they cannot do the job. What effect would that have on professional sports? Suppose that a team had to hire women just because it is fair? The quality of the team would suffer. It could never compete against major league all-men teams, and if instead all the teams were handicapped the same, the sport would suffer. (See The Old Ball Game.)

When black players entered pro ball, they brought in a determination and talent that blew the critics away. They asked no special favors or treatment, just a chance to perform. They won their rightful place and reaped the rewards. The feminists have taken a different approach. Why is that? Feminists know that the vast majority of women cannot compete equally with men. As much as the feminists hate the idea, women want to get married and have children. That means women will miss more work, often even quitting their job for years while attending their children's needs. This normal function of womanhood is an extreme disadvantage in the world that feminists want women to live in. So, instead of providing an equal or superior talent and productive resource to win acceptance in the workplace, like the black player did in baseball, the feminist demands laws and lawsuits to force companies to hire women, even when it is a detriment to the company to do so. If you do not see something wrong with that, your mind is turned to the OFF position.

Look closely at the major pro sports in American today and you will see that baseball, football and basketball teams would not be able to compete if they excluded minority players. If you look just as closely at the business world you will see that no such relationship exists between any major industry, not based on selling sex, and women. If a company is going to do better with female employees, it will hire women quickly without laws to force the issue!

The black baseball player went through quite a bit of name calling, and shunning when he first came into the big leagues. He bit the bullet and made the grade. Feminists take a different approach. They use the courts to batter name callers, and anyone who opposes their goals. When this is a clear and obvious declaration that women are too fragile to deal with the workplace, we are left to wonder why feminists would want to put themselves in such a weak looking position. Clearly they have no choice because women can never compete with men in a man's world. The world must be changed to allow them to enter it and since it has changed, they never have entered the real world of working men, and never will. Jackie Robinson entered the baseball world as it was and earned his place rightfully, making baseball better for it, but feminism has attacked the world, attempting to change it, to soften it up for women. Like fitting a square peg into a round hole, both the peg and the hole suffer.

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

The fact is that if women can provide a service that will benefit a company, no law will be required to make companies search out her services. If she is capable of working in an environment, and doing a job, then no law suits will be required to change that environment. The fact that both of these conditions are not met, demonstrates clearly that feminists are completely out of touch with reality and both women and American industry must pay the price for their confusion.³⁵

"MARX AND THE FEMINIST" (3 JANUARY 1998)

Do you remember when Americans said, "Better dead than Red," and meant it? It wasn't all that long ago. The Marxist/Socialist/Communist way of life, and its associated tyranny, were considered anathema to American life by the vast majority of our citizens. You cannot have a land of opportunity, when all are rewarded equally. You cannot have freedom when the government is telling you how to live. Your basic human right of raising your children up to believe as you do is not compatible with the Marxist goal of brainwashing the children into the party doctrine. So, what does this have to do with feminism?

Have you heard of Shulamith Firestone? Here is one of the founding "fathers" of the modern feminist movement. Her book, "The Dialectic of Sex" contains many of the concepts that are foundational to the feminist today. Her entire basis for change in America was the Marxist model. If you look at every country where Marx's philosophy has been taken seriously, you will see a country where freedom, prosperity and the pursuit of happiness have been throttled down to idle and ultimately the fire goes out. But feminists still burn with the desire to make Shulamith's dream come true.

What are some of the improvements that this feminist wanted to implement? (Since this was the goal beforehand, it is a good measuring device to see how many of these things have actually come to pass.)

- *The destruction of the family and the institution of marriage.* - Since modern feminism has taken root, you will note that families are now temporary experiments that fall apart at the first sign of trouble. The vast majority of children are no longer

raised by both of their own parents. This “improvement” has made a great deal of progress to date, and as the feminists continue to be listened to the trend will certainly worsen.

- *Total sexual liberation.* - The burning of the bra was the most classic symbolism used by the feminists kicking off their campaign in the sixties. Most Americans had no idea what the symbol was supposed to represent, but it was clearly to show the opening of the door of sexual unbridling for women. At that time, living together, while unmarried, was considered wrong for men and women by the majority of Americans. Today that attitude has pretty much gone away and the virgin bride is more often found in jokes than in a wedding ceremony.
- *The elimination of private property.* - Have you noticed how much of your right of ownership has slipped since the feminists have been at work? Taxes are up to 50% of your income. Property taxes beat at your tenuous hold on your house, threatening to dislodge your grip if you should be unemployed for a short while. You no longer can defend your property in many states. If you cannot defend it, you don't own it!
- *Easy divorce.* - Have you heard of the “no-fault” divorce? You do not need grounds for a divorce today. If one of the parties in a marriage wants out, that is all it takes. This goal has been met already in its entirety.
- *Elimination of a bread winner by having the state provide.* - The welfare state has been strongly driven by the feminists. Who has received the vast majority of welfare assistance? Why mothers with dependent children. Result, men are no longer required as breadwinners. This is a very expensive proposition and has been disastrous to our nation in very many ways, but the feminists have gotten their wish.
- *Women in control of the reproduction process.* - Does the slaughter of over 30 million innocent children ring a bell with you? Abortion has insanely become a “woman's right to choose” and the execution of children, because they are not wanted, is considered humane.
- *All women working outside the home.* - The numbers are continually growing, and the feminists are still ridiculing the women who do stay at home. This goal is nearly met, and while the disastrous results of this goal are ignored, feminists keep beating the drum for the working woman.
- *The state to provide 24 hour day care for the children.* - This one is in the works. We keep hearing day care brought up in congress and by politicians in general. The feminists are push-

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

ing hard to get this in place. The desire to eliminate the family as a training ground for children is strong in the feminist and they are doing all they can to make it happen soon.

- *Elimination of religion.* - Have you noticed how many feminists are all fired up interested in being priests and pastors? Why do you suppose that is? Since Marx was an atheist and the radical feminists are Marxist in philosophy, doesn't there seem to be some problem with the idea of being an atheistic priest? Not to the feminist! They do not care beans about religion except to eliminate it as an opposing force. How better to eliminate it than by infiltrating and destroying from the inside? If you have read anything by the feminist "theologians" you will quickly realize that they are not just putting a new perspective on older ideas. Not at all! They are completely trashing the old ideas and replacing them with wonderful sounding atheistic concepts. When they speak of God, it is tongue in cheek, calling up the pagan worship of goddesses and the priestesses. This is why that feminists do not only start up their own competing religions, to have their own freedom of religion. That would be counter productive to their cause. Instead they are attempting, with great success, to destroy the family-supporting religions which oppose them.

Marxism has been given its day on planet earth. It is a failure and always will be. Modern feminism is tied closely with Marx and as listed above, their goals are not compatible with American culture or society. They do not want equal pay for equal work. They want to reinvent the American way of life and shape it into a Marxist totalitarian state.

There are three possible outcomes from the position we are in. 1) We wake up and throw the Marxists out on their ear and rebuild the America we had before; 2) Continue to placate the feminists and dismantle America into a iron fisted dictatorship; 3) Do nothing until it becomes unbearable and have a civil war/revolution to try and reestablish the original constitution.

The first option would be extremely difficult at the moment, with the feminists controlling the schools, government and media. Where do you hear a voice against feminism today? You don't! Even though the changes that they are proposing and have already implemented into our lives are completely un-American, people are not even concerned by and large.

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

The second and third options are the easy ones for today but the extremely difficult ones for the future. In either of these cases, lives will be lost in the millions, and America will not be rebuilt in our lifetimes. We are facing a grave crisis and people do not see a problem of any serious nature.

Americanism and Marx are old enemies. Liberalism and Marx are old friends. Feminism and Marx are married.³⁶

“FEMINISTS CAN’T PICK A BETTER TIME THAN TODAY!” (19 JANUARY 1998)

Point to any time in the past, and if you can, pick a better time for women of the feminist mindset. Where in all of history can you find a time where women are free to own property, sleep with anyone they choose, vote on an equal basis with men, hold office and have a career of her choice? You would think that the poor down-trodden feminist would have found in America a Nirvana, a perfect land of plenty and perfection. She has equal pay for any job where she actually performs equal work and can kill any baby she finds out about within three month of getting pregnant. Here are all the claimed goals of the feminist movement brought to realization, today! And yet feminists are still whining away as if all of them were nothing more than the sex-slaves of John Norman’s planet Gor. Are you tired of listening to these cry babies yet?

Today, feminists claim minority status for women, proclaim that any woman who is voluntarily a homemaker is a slave, and they think that the world owes them everything that they are brash enough to cry for. They are arrogant, dishonest, and pathologically disconnected with reality. Feminists care about power for themselves and could not care less about what the average woman wants in her life. Yet, sick as this movement is today, the US Government is putting feminist demands into law, while the judicial system continually ignores the constitution, fair play, and especially JUSTICE, in order to promote feminist goals. Aren’t you fed up with this criminal neglect of the rights of all the non-feminist women and men out there?

There is absolutely no need for a feminist movement today. America has already moved well past the point of simple fairness in the dealing with women’s issues, and still these radical, fanatical

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

feminists scream, “Foul!” Indeed, if a team in sports had been given as many advantages in a game, as the feminists have been given in life, there would be a valid protest lodged by the other team, who would have every right to walk off the field:

1. Women get the custody of children in the vast majority of divorces today. Is this fair? Is this equal treatment? If men are as good at raising children as the women are (a common claim of the feminists who want men to take up the role of raising the children) why do women get custody? Where is the uproar of, “Foul!” from the feminist hoard? Hmmm?

2. Women have received the huge bulk of the over \$3 trillion paid out by the American tax payer in welfare payments. For what purpose? To raise children. If that job is so unimportant and de-meaning, why have women been paid for doing it with our tax money? Our national debt today would be nearly paid in full if we could get all of that welfare money back. If we charged interest, we would be well into the black. So, do the feminists cry, “Foul!” because of this, and do they demand that these women, who were paid for living useless, unfulfilling lifestyles - merely raising children - to get to work and pay that money back? Hmmm?

3. In our history as a nation, women have never been drafted into military service. They have reaped all the same rewards of living in a free country, and having a high standard of living, as the men who have gone out and put their own lives at risk. And yet, never have the men complained about that arrangement. Men have every right to cry, “Foul!” but they did not see it that way. Women have been given a free ride in the area of defense of self and country throughout our history. Most women, as well as men today, do not want it any other way. What are the self-focused feminists’ views on this situation? Do they care that women and men do not want to place women at risk on the battlefield? No they do not and they do not for one very simple reason. They do not care a whistle about America’s ability to defender herself. They do not care what women desire and especially they do not care what men desire. They only care about one simple fact, and it is the driving reason behind the whole movement: Women can never be equal with men in role, unless women *die on the battlefield as often as men*. Women can never be perceived as the same as men until they can *stand up and physically defend themselves* against both men and women. Since the latter

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

can never happen, feminists are attempting to create a mere simulation of that act by placing women into fighting units of the US military. Of course the women will be abused by, and useless to, the military but feminists do not care. They can now make the false claim that women are equal with men because some women are in the service. Somebody had better call, “Foul!” before we have to fight a real war against a real enemy that cannot be bombed into submission like Iraq was. (Even Iraq was able to capture and rape one of our female soldiers, and the Iraqis spent the entire war hiding from our bombers and missiles.)

While more women go to college than men, and receive far more handouts and assistance than men, there is no reason why we still have to listen to the feminists crying about how unfair the United States is to women. It is like polar bears crying that the North Pole does not produce any ice, or the fish crying that there is no water in the ocean. There is absolutely no rhyme or reason to the feminist movement today and it is time that it be placed into the same dumpster as the prohibitionist movement was.³⁷

“THE FEMALE VOTE” (30 JANUARY 1998)

AMENDMENT XIX (Ratified August 18, 1920)

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex.

Congress shall have power to enforce this Article by appropriate legislation.

If one assumes that men should naturally and rightly hold the leadership position in society, as has historically always been the case, this amendment makes no sense whatsoever. For what it does is hand the leadership and control over to women who just happen to be the majority in number. It is very much like saying that individual amounts of iron are stronger and more sturdy for building things than an equal amount of wood but for the really big projects, we will use wood. Of course you find no wooden skyscrapers, or large scale bridges but you have women running the country by proxy just because of their numbers.

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

For the feminist this is simply delightful. All of her whimsical ideas are taken seriously and she can rest assured that she can go on killing babies at a rate over a million a year indefinitely, all because women have the vote.

Are women stupid? Of course not but they have a temperament that will destroy a country if they are allowed to control things. Socialism is completely impossible in a free society and a free society will wither and die in the presence of socialism. Socialism robs the bounty from the productive and gives it to the non-productive. There is no incentive to be productive and therefore productivity vanishes, as it did in the Soviet Union. Yet women tend to vote for the security of socialism which is their basic nature.

If you want a strong and free country, you must reject the good intentioned folly of the left, in which women hold a disproportionate membership, and instead embrace the concepts and ideals that the country was originally founded on. Never was the female vote part of those ideas! Neither was welfare or government control over the tiniest detail of what the states were doing. (If that had been tried at first the original union would never have been formed between the states!) We have lost our way and I believe we have very little chance of ever finding it again. But one thing seems certain: If women continue have the vote, we may soon fall, and never be a great nation again.³⁸

“SHOULD WOMEN HAVE THE RIGHT TO VOTE?” (N.D.)

The underlying purposes of this page are to reexamine the adoption of the 19th amendment to the U.S. Constitution, and discuss its effects on American society. I realize that this issue is one that foments controversy, but it is one that needs serious evaluation. Americans seem to take it for granted that women have suffrage, but women did not receive the franchise until just 78 years ago. [Note from the webmaster: This article was written by a man who was a College senior at the time. He has since graduated. When he transferred from college, I placed this page here so that all can continue to read it.]

A Beginning Argument

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

In ancient Rome and Greece, women were not allowed to vote. Women, it was felt in these democratic societies, were not to engage in civil life. In Sparta and Athens, women were not even allowed to be citizens. In more modern times, polities (until recently) exhibited similar characteristics. At the turn of this century things began to change. Women received the franchise in Great Britain in 1928. France did not allow women to vote until 1944, and Switzerland did not grant suffrage to women until 1972. America went through a similar transformation, and extended suffrage to women in 1920. This move was a clear violation of the founding principles of the American Republic. The second president of the United States, John Adams, once wrote to his wife Abigail that he knew better than to dismantle the "Masculine" political system. America's third president, Thomas Jefferson, also realized the danger of feminizing politics. No women were at the Constitutional Convention, which is why the Constitution has been so successful. At the time the Constitution was adopted, not one state had female suffrage. The Supreme Court in 1875 said that by prohibiting women's suffrage, a state did not deprive them of the "equal protection of the laws" (see *Minor v. Happersett*, 21 Wall. 162 (1875)). Currently, any lay observer of American politics knows that most women, as has been said in our nation's history a million times by now, inherently think with their emotions. Anyone who thinks with his emotions should not be in politics, man or woman. Emotional thinking and governing a society do not mix, as the Enlightenment taught all of mankind. James Madison, our fourth president, clearly stated that an individual should think with his mind and reason, not his emotion and passion. Furthermore, John Locke believed that women had no political rights whatsoever. Obviously, we have lost track of our American roots and if this nation is to survive as a great world power, our government must be invigorated with great men who think with their reason.³⁹

"I AM MAN (ME TARZAN, YOU JANE)" (FEBRUARY 1998)

To the tune of I Am Woman...

1st verse

You are woman, I am man,

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

You can't do the things I can,
but that is not what you were meant to do,
I may be sometimes unbending
But my love is never ending;
You know that I'll always be there, for you...
(to chorus)

2nd verse

You can raise an embryo,
Inside you it will grow
And that child will make a mother out of you
Watch that child grow big and strong
As you help him right along,
No one else can do that job as well as you---- Oh,
(to chorus)

3rd verse

As a woman you should know,
No matter how you grow
Your lovin' arms reach only to your man.
Joined to him you can be strong,
By his side you walk along,
Together is your only rightful stand! ----- Oh,
(chorus)

Yes, you will be, a mother and a wife;
Raise kids and cook, and be the family's life!
On my team girl, we can do anything,
I am man, my stand's invincible, you're my woman.⁴⁰

"BIG BROTHER IS A FEMINIST!" (17 MARCH 1998)

"Men have to change!" This is said over, and over again, by the feminist proponents. Think of what that means. Who put these little nazis in charge of what men or women must do? Who suddenly decided that Americans must think in ways that make feminist happy? You did buddy!

When you sit still while the government dictates how you should think, then you support the government in its tyranny! In America,

we have the vote my friend, for the time being anyway, and that means if we don't like something we can change it. The most important right that any American has is his right to think anyway he chooses, without the government trying to apply pressure on him to change his way of thinking.

What is a "hate crime?" Think about that for a moment. What makes a criminal act, not just a criminal act but rather a despicable "hate crime?" It is the way the criminal thinks. A hate crime is a **THOUGHT CRIME**. How have we come to the point where we judge people by their thoughts, more harshly than by their actions, in our country? Is not harming another man's person or property crime enough? Is not crime sufficiently bad in and of itself without trying to load on the Big Brother aspect of the **THOUGHT CRIME**? Is it not hideous enough to kill a man or burn his church down without adding in a judgment and sentence upon the perpetrator's thoughts? This government move into the world of judging our thoughts rather than our actions, and setting itself up as the moral compass of our citizenry is a terrifying expedition into tyranny!

Another area of government abuse of power is shown by the following. If you take your hard earned savings, and create a company with those dollars, who has the right to tell you what individuals you should hire as employees? If you feel more comfortable with having an all male, or all female company, whose business is it? Does Uncle Sam have the right to deny you the opportunity to hire anyone you choose? Does Uncle Sam have the right to make your moral decisions for you at all? Of course not! If a man comes to you looking for a job and he is supporting his wife and children on the income that your company will be providing to him you have the right to hire that man over any woman applying for that position. In fact if your head is on straight, you have a moral obligation to hire first any man who is attempting to be the sole bread winner in a family, allowing his wife to mind the children just like it has always been in America.

The government is taking that moral choice away from all employers, and instead is forcing companies to hire women for positions, and turning down men who would be providing the sole support for their family, men who would often be better qualified for the job. The government is counting the number of women you hire. You can be prosecuted or sued for not hiring a woman over a man if

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

your decision was based upon gender. If you believe that a woman's place is in the home, you can be persecuted and run out of business. It is now a crime to believe in patriarchy as a goal for society, and to promote it in your business.

Welcome to the land of the once free. The government is now deeply into the area of thought control, and the Politically Correct movement is one of the heads of this monster. If a man today acts like the average American male from the 1950's did, he would be fired, sued and/or thrown into jail and never be let out, for his ideas! He would be sued for whistling at a pretty woman and being patronizing to females in the workplace. And yet men who thought just like that built this country from the ground up. Whether or not you agree with his way of thinking, you should be gravely concerned that he no longer has a right to live his life as he sees fit, without the government's boot upon his neck!

Government control of our thoughts is not part of our constitution! What is the first amendment, except a declaration that free thought would always be a part of our country? If you can freely speak it, and print it, then you certainly will be free to think it! When the government decides that it knows best what and how you should think, you are no longer living in a free country. Today the government may be promoting your ideas, and you may think that they are good ones, worthy of government support. But tomorrow the ideas the government champions may be completely against what you believe and there will be nothing you can do about it because you did not stop it today, while you still could, and you will weep because it will be you who is persecuted, prosecuted and sued.

The basic right to believe what you want, and to act upon that belief, must be protected! Including the right of the employer to hire anyone he chooses, by whatever criteria he chooses, without the government judging how he thinks. It must be remembered that your loss of freedom will come for a good cause. The government will always find a marvelous reason for taking your liberty away from you. Maybe it will be for the children, for the poor, for your health, or for improved race relations. Whatever the cause will be, you can be sure that it will be worthwhile. "Just give up some of your liberty and make the country a better place to live," says the politician. Don't be a fool!

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

Ben Franklin put it in a nutshell when he said that those who are willing to give up freedom for security, deserve neither. If you wish to live in a free country, you must vote for men and measures that promote freer action and less control. Less control of your money, with much lower taxes, and far less control of your mind. Government promoted THOUGHT CONTROL has no place in America and it is time that we ran it out on a rail!⁴¹

“KIDS KILLING CLASSMATES” (26 MARCH 1998)

Do you see it in the news? Today in Arkansas, tomorrow who knows? What is making kids into killers these days? Is it some deep dark secret? Or is there an answer that is easy to see?

What is making kids turn so violent today, whether it is with guns, knives or baseball bats, is a two-headed monster. The number one reason is that parents have stopped taking responsibility for their children. Mothers are not home with their kids after school and neither parent is monitoring, and instructing kids on the difference between right and wrong. Children are left on their own to entertain themselves anyway that they can find. As the old saying goes, “Idle hands make the Devil’s playthings.” Without instruction into what proper behavior is, without constant reminders by a supervising parent, kids will drift into trouble. They also desire and need attention from their parents, and will do whatever it takes to get it. Even criminal things.

The second reason kids are not only getting into trouble, but are going so far as to killing their classmates, is that American parents have completely lost their minds by letting their children watch television and movies and to play video games. Stop and think of the horrors most kids have witnessed on TV, especially with the VCR hooked up to it. They see men killing tens or even hundreds of people without giving it a second thought. None of those deaths have any real consequences either. Seldom are weeping family members or orphaned children witnessed in these movies. It is just another guy put on the ground. How cool! The video games in arcades are amazing today. Take a close look at what is happening on those screens on the games your kids are playing. Today a child can pretend to drive down the road and shoot people driving by, in living color, with plenty of blood. FOR FUN! Anyone who thinks that this

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

is an innocent pastime, with no connection to the huge increase in violent tendencies in our youth is a blithering idiot!

These two separate causes are interconnected greatly. When mother works, she has no time to monitor what the kids are doing. It is so much easier to rent a video for the kids when you are tired, than to take your time to do something with the kids. It is so much easier to write off these destructive pastimes with the thought that everybody is doing it, when you are exhausted from a hard day at work. The kids have to do something while waiting for Mom to get home from work! Why not have them watch a movie? And what parent has the time and energy or even the inclination to sit down and talk it over with their children after they have been exposed to a hundred deaths in the last two hours? Queue up another movie.

When you leave your kids alone, you increase the odds that another tragedy will occur. When you support Hollywood by going to, or renting movies filled with activities that you would be appalled to have your children involved in, you are making the problem worse. All actions have consequences and it is time Americans woke up to the consequences of their own foolish actions. Mothers need to be home with their kids and Hollywood does not! Video games are not simple, innocent pastimes. Wake up before your kids become the next focus of the nightly news as a victim or a perpetrator. It could happen tomorrow!⁴²

"THE PERFECT MOTHER" (6 APRIL 1998)

She wiped a tear from her eye. She was so proud! Her son had graduated from high school with flying colors last month. It was only to be expected! Why not, hadn't he had a great start? He had gone to a day care center which promoted learning to read, before he could even walk! He had continued on to a high quality pre-school. If she had not been so successful in her job, he could have never done it!

She wiped away another tear. Why was she crying? It must be her personal pride! Her son's life -- filled with top rate activities -- which only her hard work could have supplied. Who needed his father? She had tired of him early and was happy that he had gone. She thought of how hard she had searched for a nanny, to watch over her son, during most evenings when she had to work late. It

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

made her feel very secure to contemplate how well it had worked out. He had never wanted for anything.

They closed the lid and carried away the coffin of her son, who had died from a mother's neglect. And she finally found her eyes completely dry. She was a proud woman of the nineties, and she had done a wonderful job raising her son. She would remember all the things she had done for him until the day she died. But somehow she was very glad that she had aborted all her other children.⁴³

"THE FEMINIST FLOWCHART" (7 APRIL 1998)

So, you want to be a feminist? Here is a flowchart that will make it easy for you!

KEY TO THE FLOWCHART

C1 - Close your eyes.

NOTE: This is a critical first step. If your eyes are open it is impossible to be a feminist.

Q1 - Do you believe women are exactly the same as men?

C2 - Repeat out loud 100 times: "Women are exactly the same as men."

NOTE: Without this step of denying reality, feminism will have to be rejected!

Q2 - Do children specifically need mothers?

C3 - Repeat out loud 100 times: "Anyone can fill the role of a mother for my children, including fathers, day care centers, baby sitters, schools, television or video games."

NOTE: Unless it is thoroughly believed that women are easily replaceable in their traditional role as mother, feminism will appear to be a selfish destructive force which will deny children their basic needs.

Q3 - Is a totalitarian government best?

C4- Repeat out loud 100 times: "Big government is my friend!"

NOTE: If citizens are allowed to act freely, men will naturally dominate. Feminism is therefore impossible in a truly free society.

Q4 - Should women kill their own young?

C5- Repeat out loud 100 times: "A woman has the right to choose to kill her children!"

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

NOTE: If a woman has to waste her time raising kids she can never accomplish the goals a feminist will have. This is fundamental!

Q5 - Are female athletes as good as male athletes?

C6- Repeat out loud 100 times: "Women pros play tennis, basketball, and all other sports as well as the male pros!"

NOTE: In order to be truly equal, women must be able to physically defend themselves equally well as men do. Since sports are merely a simulation of war, women must play with equal skill to that which men have in order to be completely equal.

Q6 - Do you hate masculine males?

C7- Repeat out loud 100 times: "All truly masculine men are bad!"

NOTE: Masculine males will naturally dominate females. They will not ever feel strong loyalty towards a female supervisor or take her completely seriously in that role. Truly masculine males will, by their very existence show the complete absurdity of feminism. Feminism must therefore create a society where masculine males are suppressed by the government and held under control.

Having reached the end of the flow chart, you are now properly conditioned to be a feminist. It is strongly recommended that you go through this flow chart on an extremely regular basis to maintain your conditioning. Otherwise you will find reality pushing in and destroying your belief in this ridiculous philosophy!⁴⁴

"ODE TO MY WENCH" (6 APRIL 1998)

WENCH

Pronunciation: 'wench

Function: noun

Etymology: Middle English *wenche*, short for *wenche*
(meaning child), from Old English *wencel*

Date: 14th century

Definition: a young woman;

Synonyms: girl, damsel, gal, lass, lassie, maid, maiden, miss, missy

W's for wonderful, the way you make me feel.

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

E is for an eyeful, a full esthetic meal.
N means near and friendly girl, and that is what I like.
C's for oh so cuddly, you are my lucky strike.
H is for here and handy, just as a wench should be,
And that is why you are, the only girl for me!
So my Darling now you know, just why my wench you are,
More than just a bright spot, the only living star.
My woman is my goddess, my woman is my wife,
My woman's all to me, my woman is my life,
My woman's my buoyant force, to lift above life's stench,
My woman's all there is, I love my little wench!⁴⁵

"PRESIDENT CLINTON HAS DECLARED FEMINISM TO BE ANTI-CHILDREN!" (19 APRIL 1998)

He may not have realized it, and may not have intended it, but today, January 26, 1998, Bill Clinton made a statement in his press conference which clearly attacks working women and the feminist movement! Our president stated that the time of day where most children get into trouble is the hours from 3pm to 7pm. Here are the hours in which mothers have abandoned their children in favor of their careers. Here we have the President of the United States proclaiming to the world that children who are neglected and ignored by working women are in trouble and in need of help. What is Mr. Clinton's solution? The same as liberals always give: create more government spending to pay for the liberal idea that has failed.

The liberal idea that has failed is the idea of the career women. Today Bill Clinton openly admitted that fact and has proposed a liberal solution for the problem, which *was caused by liberalism in the first place*. Bill Clinton wants the American taxpayer to foot a portion of the bill for daycare for women who wish to abandon their children during the hours from 3pm to 7pm in favor of a job. Why should we pay that bill? Do we do it just because liberals demand that we support a cause financially to which we may be vehemently oppose morally, ethically and politically? Should women be responsible for their own children or should the government be responsible? If the government is responsible for the children, then the government also will take authority over them and their education! Have the American people not learned yet that *what the government*

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

pays for it controls? Take a close look at the public school system and you will see what the government will do to an institution that it pays for, even though it pays for it with your money.

It is almost funny the way liberals work. They will unabashedly admit the validity of something today, to get some new program initiated, for which they had declared utterly false, and had fought tooth and nail to establish that falsehood, in order to get some other concession. Before today, working women were considered "good mothers." (Looking at Clinton's admission today, I have to laugh at the liberals who have emailed me with large claims of career women who are such.) Now, it is clear that the mother who is absent from home during the hours of 3pm to 7pm is definitely a bad mother and not keeping her kids out of trouble as she should. We have the President's own statement to support it. Of course these days that is not necessarily much support but it is great to see a liberal fessin' up to the truth for a change, even if it is only to create another problem area with government sponsored daycare for abandoned children.

Yes, the same feminists who have killed over 30 million pre-born babies, and promoted the abandonment of the rest, are now trying to make you believe that they love the children and that they just want the poor little darlings to be taken care of properly. However, *daycare is not , and never has been, "taking care of children properly"*, and feminists have not suddenly started to love children after attacking and killing them for so long. Wake up! We are destroying a whole generation of children and we do have this little thing called *the future* to think about. It is time for feminists and liberals in general to start thinking about their own children and the future and stop thinking only of themselves.

Even liberal men are men and feminism will never overcome it!
Sorry ladies of the left.⁴⁶

"WHY BOYS DON'T COUNT" (27 APRIL 1998)

I just read an article by Kathleen Parker, in the Orlando Sentinel, that talks about education, boys and girls. It mentioned the fact that the American Association of University Women did a study on girls in school and have found that girls on average do not perform any better in a single sex environment than they did in coed schools.

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

This is quite disappointing to the feminists who were hoping that girl students were merely oppressed by the boy students and that was why they had inferior marks. Why did they not speak up as often as the boys in math class? The same reason that they did not speak up in the all-girl classroom. They did not know the answer!

Do you remember a while back when the feminists pressured the makers of Barbi to pull the new speaking version of the doll off the market? Do you remember why? One of the phrases that Barbie said was, "Math is hard!" The feminists were livid. They could hardly contain themselves as they went on the attack and got the doll pulled from the shelves. The very idea that math might be considered hard was a threat to their little empire. Girls are so delicate, females so fragile, that the very idea of something being difficult will dissuade them from even attempting it. That is what the feminists were saying by these stupid antics!

Back to the subject at hand. This much was not the total focus of the article. No, the real point of the article is that the liberals in control of our society are insane. Oh, it did not say that specifically but it pointed it out quite clearly anyway. Our society's liberal leaders are insane because they condemn, ridicule and penalize those who have done well in the past. The American culture is battered in the class room. Those so unfortunate as to be members of the white race are put down. Those who happen to be of the male gender are ignored. Everything that has worked in the past, and everyone who has made valuable contributions to our history, or has made a huge success in business is belittled and an attempt is made to intellectually destroy that person, concept or ideal. That is completely insane in my book!

Specifically the article pointed out that this American Association of University Women study was totally unconcerned with the boys in the classroom. The fact the boys would be putting their education to work in a job, which males have been doing all along, made them of no consequence to the study. Many women will start a job and give it up for their families and especially their children. I applaud that! The men will put their education to work in almost every case. This means that, as far as getting an education is concerned, the most important students in any classroom are the males. The females must be considered lesser students because less of them

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

will be using their education for productive labor. Since this is an undeniable fact, why did this study ignore the boys?

Once again the feminist mind can be seen busily at work, spinning its obscene and twisted web. Once again we can find their personal insanity driving our educational system into ruin. Boys do not count to feminists. Whether these sad women are lesbian, or merely anti-male for some other reason, they are only focused on how the female can take the place of the male in our society. They keep studying the question, and ignore every piece of evidence that comes along which says women are made to be in the home, and taking care of the children.

The foam fairly froths from their mouths as they picket for the right to slaughter innocent babes in the womb. Why? Because children distract women. Women naturally want to nurture and care for their children. I honestly believe that feminists are more angry at women than they are at men! When women act in a way that is natural to them, it is completely anti-feminist. There is nothing more counter productive to the feminist movement than a babe at his mother's breast. There is nothing that upsets the feminist apple cart more than a mother walking her kids to the park on a daily basis. It is absolute ruin for the feminists to have a mother who is home whenever the kids are out of school.

So, is it any wonder that they do not care about boys in school? Do they care at all whether a boy succeeds, optimizing his potential? No, feminists could not possibly care any less about the boys in school. When push comes to shove it appears that they do not really care about the girls in school either. All they really are concerned with is their political agenda, no matter how many boys and girls are hurt by it.⁴⁷

"SPORTS AND THE FEMINIST" (4 MAY 1998)

**From the Kenai Peninsula Borough School District in Soldotna,
Alaska**

**Philosophy-Goals-Objectives and Comprehensive Plans BP 0410
<http://www.kpbsd.k12.ak.us/board/policy/0000/0410bp.html>**

The School Board is committed to equal opportunity for all individuals in education. District programs and activities shall be free from discrimination based on gender, race, color, religion, national origin, ethnic group,

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

marital or parental status, physical or mental disability or any other unlawful consideration. The Board shall promote programs which eliminate discriminatory practices.

Read that over and contemplate what it means. Herein is the essence of the insanity which has engulfed our nation. Here we see feminism and other liberal crazies at their very worst!

What if we said that the best hotel in town could not discriminate against those who could not afford to pay? How long would it stay in business? And if the government paid the tab, how long would it be the best hotel in town? You would have the hotel filled up with people who had no respect for the hotel's property, no concern for the other patrons of the hotel. In short you would create a ghetto where a prime establishment had been, in very short order.

What if we said that the track team must not discriminate against those in wheel chairs (which is exactly what the statement from the Kenai Peninsula Borough School District above is demanding)? What sort of track team would you produce? And if taken to its logical conclusion you must throw out keeping score and times and records because they discriminate against those who cannot come out on top by their own efforts.

What we have come down to in the United States of America is this: no reward shall be given based solely upon merit. No school shall accept the applicants based solely upon test scores, grades or any other measuring criteria of academic excellence. The government has deemed it unlawful to do so. Period.

I ask you, what is the point of even having an institution of higher learning if you are not looking for the best students to enroll there? How can inferior students compete or even get by, in a curriculum that is geared for the best students? They cannot of course. Yet, there they are by government decree. The school must accept them and ultimately pass at least some of them. There is only one way that the school can do that, and that is of course to lower the standards of that college or university to the point where the best students will be trained at a much lower level than they would have been otherwise. Liberals have sent a nuclear torpedo into the hull of our educational system, and still we are allowing liberals with insane ideas like these, people like Bill and Hilary Clinton, to go about their business as if they were not destroying the education of our country's children.

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

Feminism. My web page is focused on that one head of the liberal monster attacking our country today. So, let's talk about what the above official policy of the Kenai Peninsula Borough School District, which is based upon the federal statutes, means. We have a court ruling that all government controlled schools (another words any school which takes any federal assistance at all) must spend as much on any girl's sporting program as they do on any boy's sporting program. Notice what the effect of this is. Now a school must spend double the amount on sporting programs as it did before. If the court had instead ruled that all schools must allow girls to compete for the available positions already available in the sporting programs, at least a case could be built for the fairness of the ruling. It would not take into consideration the additional costs that females always bring along when they are involved with a program like that but let us set that aside for the moment. Since women could never, or at least extremely rarely, ever qualify in competition against males in any major sport, there would be no women athletes in schools. So, the court decided arbitrarily that schools much support the inferior female athlete at the same level as the male athlete. The effect of this has been to close down male sporting programs all across the country at schools where they could not afford two programs, but could afford to run one program. This is called fairness by the liberal. It is called outrageous by anyone else.

The whole process is designed to weaken America. This is not a mere offshoot or side effect of the liberal cause. They want to destroy America's strength, in order to be able to rule themselves. They wish to beat down the very men who, if trained to be strong would pose a threat to their power. They want to make all Americans as weak as women and dress the whole process up in bright colors and call it "fairness."

Hurrah for fairness! We can now watch terrible basketball played by lousy WNBA "athletes."

Hurray for fairness! We can now have our companies sued out of existence by women who feel threatened by the "hostile" working environment.

Hurray for fairness! American families are ripped apart by the working woman.

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

Hurray for fairness! Our schools are being made competition free and grades are fast becoming a thing of the past, while the schools graduate less and less well educated students.

The federal government has lorded over these, and hundreds of other “fair” steps towards a weakened America. Your rights, your pride in your country, and the security that you are owed as a citizen of this great country are all being taken in the name of “fairness.” I for one am sick to death of it!⁴⁸

“THE REAL SPECIAL OLYMPICS” (4 MAY 1998)

We have a program set up for those who cannot compete with the healthy, normal athletes, called the Special Olympics. It is a great opportunity for those who otherwise would not have an opportunity to participate in athletics to get out and compete. I applaud this program! But let us stop and think a minute about why these individuals are not invited to the real Olympics.

Ah, the Olympics! The celebration. The pageantry. The torch being carried for such a long distance, handed off from runner to runner and finally used to light the Olympic flame. Let the games commence. Here we have an institution where we can watch the worlds very best athletes in competition with each other. Or do we?

Let us take the 100-meter run. In 1996 the fastest time put in was 9.84 seconds. It was a good time. (In 1908 it had been 10.8 seconds.) There were several men who came close to that time but they were not the best, and so the gold medal went to Donovan Bailey of Canada. The winner of that event had been established for those Olympic games.

But wait! They are running the same race again. The fastest time in the second 100-meter event is only 10.94. They award a gold medal for this inferior time. A time that was beaten by most if not all of the losers of the first event. A time that would have lost clear back in 1908, when diet and training conditions were abysmal! Obviously we are looking at the Special Olympics section of these games and the medals for that certainly are not considered the same as for the real event. Are they?

For some reason, or for lack of it, the Gold Medal for Gail Devers’ time of 10.94 is awarded a medal that is counted just as if it were the real Gold Medal for the United States. Can this be? Is it

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

just a foul up? No. We have the same thing happening in the 200-meter, 400-meter, 800-meter, 1500-meter, 10,000-meter, 5,000-meter and the marathon. We find a long list of other track and field events where the same thing is happening, along with many swimming events. This is not a fluke, it is by design.

We have a Special Olympics section included in the real Olympics, where we count the medals, whether Gold, Silver or Bronze, equally with the real medals and no one bats an eye, except apparently me. We do not have a 200 meter run to see who is the fastest in the world. Instead we have two 200 meter runs: one to see who is the fastest in the world; and the second to see who is the fastest member of the Special Olympics participants. Why? Because it is politically correct. How is it that we can exclude other lesser athletes from the Olympics and yet still allow women to compete? Is it fair? No. Is it consistent? No. If we were consistent we would have events and invite any who could qualify through performance to participate. We would not have the real events and then the Special Olympic events run side by side, counting medals from each as if they were equal, because they are not.

We do not have an Olympic event to see who is the fastest one-legged human on earth. We do not have an event to see who is the fastest human, 100 pounds overweight. Who knows? Maybe they will someday. That seems to be the way the PC crowd is moving the nation. The Olympics today are already a joke with all the events that they are putting in, and of course letting women compete in them, but only against themselves.

In Greece, the original Olympics excluded women. Instead women had their own Special Olympics separate from the real thing. I may be a minority of one but I think that was a wise choice.⁴⁹

"THE SCARLET LETTER" (5 MAY 1998)

Hester Prynne was a woman who committed adultery, under circumstances that gave even the Puritans a touch of sympathy, for they condemned her not to death, which was well within their legal power, but rather ruled that she would be forced to wear upon her breast the letter "A," made of red cloth and large enough for all to clearly see.

I have heard feminists discuss this book and it is a riot to listen to. They envision Hester as a feminist, proud to wear her badge of courage in the face of the patriarchal society. This is too funny to be believed. It shows how far that a feminist is willing to bend the truth in order to make their own personal world view look rational, which it never will.

Hester walked around Boston with her head held down in shame for seven years. I used to live outside of Boston and have visited the House of Seven Gables, and witnessed the very desk where Nathaniel Hawthorne penned many of his words. However, the Boston of the 17th century was indeed different than it is today, or even than it was in 1850 when the *Scarlet Letter* was written. Today a quarter of the newborn population is born out of wedlock. We are much wiser today don't you think?

Hester failed to disagree with the verdict handed down upon her. She lived at the edge of town with the little bastard girl, Pearl, she had given birth to. She earned their support by doing embroidery work of the finest quality. But always she was an outcast, and believed herself to be deservedly so. The man who had shamed her was so laden with guilt that he ultimately died from it. Hester, after taking her daughter away to start a new life, returned to live out her own life in Boston, wearing the *Scarlet Letter*.

Hester did not reject the moral norms of her day, although she was led outside of them briefly by her passion and loneliness. She did seem to detect some hypocrisy from the people of the town but never judged them. She did not in any way wish to be alone and unmarried. It was a punishment to her and she accepted it.

Where was the feminism in this story? It does not exist. Hester lived the life of a woman of her time. She had no yearning to do men's work, or desire to be politically equal with men. She had no aspirations to feminism or any of its goals. Indeed she did all in her power to do womanly good deeds around the town, to the point where people began to think of the *Scarlet Letter* as representing the word "angel" rather than "adultery."

For some strange reason, feminists today do not have the ability to grasp reality. They look through glasses tinted with fairy dust which makes all things fit into their misguided world view. The *Scarlet Letter* was not a feminist story nor did it advance the feminist cause one pace. It was a story of a woman, who lived as a wom-

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

an, and who died as a woman, without a single aspiration of living as a man. Read the book.⁵⁰

"THE BOTTOM LINE" (9 MAY 1998)

I recently read a book that has confirmed to me everything that I have written in the articles on this web page. The name of the book is *Brain Sex* and was written by Anne Moir & David Jessel. Here is proof of the fact that male and female brains are completely different. It also establishes that certain characteristics are naturally male and female. Here is scientific proof that the feminists are completely wrong, as was obvious to any unbiased observer all along! Biology is sexist and any attempt to avoid sexism is UNNATURAL!

Even within a day of birth, mental differences are evident between boys and girls, completely separate from any environmental influences upon the children. During the early years boys and girls act differently, no matter what the parents do! When puberty hits the differences become even greater. If you want proof of that which should be obvious, but is invisible to the feminists, read this book!

The more masculine the human brain is, the more it will be aggressive, competitive, and tend towards mechanical understanding and interest. The more feminine the human brain is the more it will be passive, agreeable, and nurturing. Little girls play different games than little boys because they like different games than little boys. It is not Mommy and Daddy making the choice for them.

As adults the difference is extreme, as hormones drive the brains that were made physically different in the womb by those same hormones. Men are driven towards achievement, competition, and mechanical understanding. Women are driven towards social relationships, nurturing and verbal communication. It is so basic as to be beyond any training or environmental influence outside the presence or absence of sexual hormones.

What all this means is that, if the government would get out of the way and let people act naturally, instead of forcing the unnatural feminist propaganda upon our children, the natural and unavoidable patriarchal system would snap back into place. The stupidity of the feminist movement was in its trying to remove patriarchy instead of trying to make it more sophisticated and sensitive to the needs of women. When changes appeared to be needed, no effort was made

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

to effect those changes. Instead the entire force of the feminist movement was put into trying to destroy that which is biologically put into place and outside of their control. An artificial arrangement has been put into place today where the dominant and submissive must pretend to be equal in desires, needs and accomplishments. Not only is this absurd, it is destructive.

A society which is not organized in such a way as to compliment the severe differences which are naturally existent in the genders is doomed to failure. American society originally was set up to support the inherent differences in the sexes but today has tried to create an impossible unisex society. It will fail, because biology says it must fail. To build a society that is tailored to function best only for the abnormal male or female is foolish at the best and suicidal at the worst.

The government must stand aside and let nature take its course or the emotional reservoir which is backing up as a result will break loose in a disastrous orgy of destruction. Men are going to rule in any society, one way or another. The male mind is designed that way. Instead of fighting that inevitable event, we should be training young boys to be good leaders instead of denying them that needed training and trying to make them passive coequals with women, who naturally are not leaders.

Go with what works and is possible, and throw out that which is not and does not. Do it before it is too late to put the pieces back together in our America!⁵¹

"THE CHAUVINIST SHAKESPEARE" (13 MAY 1998)

At Arizona State University, the theater department fired acting professor Jared Sakren, a graduate of Juilliard's drama division and a former Yale professor whose students included Val Kilmer, Kelly McGillis, Annette Bening, and Oscar award-winner Frances McDormand. Why? Because he was determined to stage plays by Shakespeare.

What, you might ask, is wrong with Shakespeare? Get this:

"As someone who teaches a course in feminism," department chairman Mrs. Lin Wright wrote in 1996, "I have serious reservations about [Mr. Sakren's] view of women." Campus feminists, she

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

said, were "offended by the selections [of] works from a sexist European canon."

Is it getting through to you yet? Courses in college classes on the subject of feminism, where the foremost experts in this area of study, teach women that Shakespeare is a sexist author that should not be studied. The entire history of mankind will soon be placed off limits by these nut cases!

Must we coddle our intellectual positions so completely? Are factual, or fictional dramatic studies of the past so scary to the feminist, that they must be completely sheltered from it? Mrs. Wright says, "Yes!" She says it so strongly so as to cost a man his job!

When is it that an individual must hide from the facts? When the individual knows that his point of view is wrong, and that the fallacy of his beliefs will be demonstrated by the revelation of the facts. The very fear feminists have, of any other point of view being openly expressed, is a clear statement that they know their cause is a sham!

Today I received an email from a woman who proclaimed that I shouldn't even be allowed to display anti-feminist material on the web. The author was terrified that a young person might actually visit my page and be dissuaded from her belief in the propaganda that the feminists are force-feeding the youngest members of society. Imagine that. Here on the web a child can see pictures of adult material, but ideas are too horrible for them to view. The feminists can shove their ideas down the throats of students but the other side of the question must be avoided at all costs.

The feminists' desperation is quite refreshing, for it is a surrender -- clear, public, and total -- to the fact that their position is indefensible and void of any semblance of validity.

Arizona State story located in:

US News Outlook 3/30/98; ON SOCIETY; BY JOHN LEO⁵²

"I'M NOT A FEMINIST. BUT..." (14 MAY 1998)

Women have written those words to me over and over again. This is probably the single most visible indication of the effectiveness of the feminist movement! Women today desire all the things the feminists started out originally to achieve, and yet mentally do a disconnect and say that they are not feminists. Many polls have

shown this to be true. Women do not even remember what feminism actually is.

Feminists were burning their bras back in the 1960's to demonstrate that they were no longer going to be sex objects. Now, that was an interesting start to this whole mess, since men were suddenly totally focused on the newly freed portion of the women's movement. If anything, a braless woman was more of a sex object than she was before burning the abhorred device, but feminists have never been accused of being overly logical.

As the movement got off to such a clumsy (dare I say bumpy?) start, the feminists started yelling at the top of their political voices that they wanted equality. They wanted to get the same pay for doing the same job. Today they have that. (Anytime that a woman does the exact same job as a man, she gets the exact same pay for it.) The women who claim that they are not feminists still demand that same equality in pay, but somehow have the capacity to disavow any connection with the original authors of that demand.

If a woman today can put in the same number of hours, perform the same tasks and be as dedicated to her job as the workaholic male she is competing with, she will reach the same heights that he will. The self-proclaimed non-feminist women are in support of that, and at the same time try to distance themselves from the movement which put women in that position.

Like the Cowardly Lion, these women have been dragged into the presence of the Wizard, and are now happy to be there. Yet, unlike that lion, they are disavowing any attachment to those responsible for their perceived good fortune. Hypocrisy is the only word that can rightly describe the attitude of women who love the feminist ideal of equality but claim that they are not feminists!

Here's the funniest part. Most of these women who have written to me have self-righteously lambasted both sides, and then they proceeded to promote every one of the feminist's goals. Come clean. 'Fess up. If you think that men and women are equal in role, you are a feminist and there is no use in denying it. Quit pretending to be on the fence, like you are better than the feminists and the traditionalists. You are lying to yourself and the world. Quit it already!

If you are not a feminist, then stand up against it! Support programs in schools which differentiate between the sexes. Make sure that girls graduate from high school with the homemaker skills that

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

they need. Home economics should be a big part of most girls schooling. Support classes in school which teach boys the manly art of how to head up a household. Promote the family in a positive way by insuring that your children are not programmed into being little feminist clones as they are today. If that concept sticks in your craw, if you feel that you cannot support such a sexist effort, then you need to buff up your honesty to the point where you can clearly admit that you are a feminist and stop spreading the lie that you are not!⁵³

"JUST SAY, 'NO!'" (21 AUGUST 1998)

Here's a chance to change the world in a very positive way. If you are tired of seeing the majority of marriages coming apart, just say, "No!" If you are tired of seeing children having children, just say, "No!" If you are tired of sexual encounters in the office, just say, "No!" If you are tired of seeing high crime rates for children, just say, "No!" If you are sick and tired of seeing some cast iron battle ax on TV telling you how bad all those sexist men are, just say, "No!" If you think a man has a natural role as leader of his family, just say, "No!" If you think that women have an important role as mothers, just say, "No!"

Just say, "No!" to feminism. It is very easy really. Think for yourself. Tell the liberal nutcases to get lost. Instead of just accepting what the liberals are saying, give it some thought. Look at history. Most of all see what has happened to our country ever since we gave control to the left wingers. Look at how many women are struggling to raise kids alone, or fighting to get a step-father/step-child relationship to work. Look how many families just cannot exist with the attitude of the "90's" pulling them apart. What has caused all of these problems to become so serious today?

Mentally back up if you will. Back, back until you reach a point in time where most marriages did not come apart. A place where most children were raised clear up until adulthood by both of their real, biological parents. Back to just before the modern feminist movement took control of the children of our country. What was it like back then? Why was it different and what made it better than today? Men and women had separate roles. These roles were based on simple biological reality.

Men, to a much greater extent than women, have been given a natural drive to compete and conquer. They are stronger and have an ego that requires a position of respect and power. They pride themselves on being able to defend themselves and their families. They tend to be less socially motivated and more career motivated. Men are not as concerned with neatness in their dwelling place, nor are they extremely taken with babies.

Women, to a much greater extent than men, tend to be nurturers and relationship oriented. They have patience with children and a natural drive to take care of their little ones. They are weaker and rely on others for their physical protection. Even if they work outside the home, they still are more focused on social relationships than maximizing a career advancement path. Women tend to be a civilizing influence on men, steering them away from violence. They tend to be neater and more interesting in living in a clean and tidy house, with freshly laundered and well pressed clothes.

If you take away the feminist bias from your reasoning and take those natural attributes of men and women and shake them up together what do you get? Why you come up with the perfect marriage that will last a lifetime. You come up with the traditional marriage where the husband is the bread-winner, the protector and head of the family, and the wife is a homemaker, taking care of the house and children, making sure both are kept in order.

This simple arrangement has worked for thousands of years and will work for thousands more if life on earth lasts that long. When biology dictates, down to the very physical makeup of the brain, that the sexes are different, it only makes sense to use those differences to the best advantage. Women can be great mothers, while men absolutely cannot be. Mr. Mom is a completely ridiculous concept and always will be, because biology says so. Men were made to go out and compete with other men. Women were not designed by nature to compete with men.

So, what was it that was lost and thereby destroyed the families of America? Traditional roles! Bring back the traditional, biology-based, roles and you will see the divorce rate drop immediately. You want your kids to be raised by both of their real parents? You want to have a marriage that lasts a lifetime? You want to have kids that grow up to be law-abiding, parent-respecting young men and women? JUST SAY NO TO FEMINISM!⁵⁴

**"THE CRUELLA DE VILLE OF THE FEMINIST MOVEMENT" (22
DECEMBER 1998)**

Who is it that can do the most harm to the family by promoting the feminist agenda? Who can do the most towards promotion of the feminist ideals? The feminist conservative!

She is driven towards excelling in her career. She runs for public office. She is often single and striving for independence, and self sufficiently. She does not need a man, and makes sure that she never really will. She is all of the things that a true blue feminist of the 1960s would have wanted in a woman.

Today this woman calls herself an "anti-feminist conservative." By doing so she closes the door on the true anti-feminist traditional who would be running for office instead, campaigning legitimately for the family and not providing a hypocritical example of blatant feminism while proclaiming herself to be an anti-feminist!

Where is the case against feminism actually being made today? Only on a few pages such as this and on a few fundamentalist Christian radio shows. The media is sure to pass no real anti-feminist thought out to the public, unless it is painted in a very bad light. Instead the anti-feminist example is this professional woman, portrayed as the "smart" conservative who is "pro-family."

The absurdity of this image is somehow lost to the public. The main harm that the feminist movement has done is to rip families apart by sending women out into the workforce. (See Feminism and Divorce.) How can one claim to be anti-feminist when one is a member of the professional working women? It is like a Catholic Priest saying he is against Catholicism. It is of course absurd.

While nearly all of feminism is absurd, much of it is clearly so, and therefore of no real danger to our families. However, this feminist in false colors is much more of a danger for she will be working the opposing camp from the inside. She stands for "family values" while doing all she can to help the working woman and very little to help the far more important stay-at-home mom. She provides a high profile example to all the little conservative girls of how not to be a good wife and mother.

And what of the men. The one area that seems to be on the back burner to all people who are most concerned with feminism is what

to with the men? Do we just shoot them? If you read the Unavoidable Bottom Line you will see that men are made to lead, to work a career and anything that provides competition. Men are terrible mothers but are good fathers, providing protection, strength, consistency and discipline. In politics they are quite capable, as demonstrated by the founding fathers and most of two centuries of female-free political leadership in the US to bring us to the pentacle of the world. Feminism wants to throw all of that out the window and rewrite the rules. They have done it. Just read any book today and you will see some very stupid things. You will see words like congressperson, and police officer, instead of the traditional congressman and policeman. These masculine roles are now gender neutral, as if anyone really wants a police woman to come to their aid when a big old burglar is breaking into their house.

Traditionally men did the work to bring home the bacon, leaving the wife at home to take care of the home and the children. Feminists hated that arrangement and set out to change it, as one of their primary goals. Today, no one is doing more to assist the feminists in attaining that goal than the conservative feminist. Any traditionalist is left with absolutely no one to vote for when a woman conservative takes up the Republican slot in a political race. A vote for a woman is a vote against the traditional family. A traditional woman would never run for office, nor should she.

We are left in a situation where there is no opposition whatsoever to true feminism. The wacko lesbian man hater can be ridiculed in certain circles but when Bob Dole's wife talks of running for president as the Republican candidate, no one is laughing as they should. When conservative families send their girls off to college instead of to the marriage altar there are no tears wept for the families that have been almost certainly weakened and probably destroyed by that action. Instead of teaching our girls how to be good wives we are teaching them how to be anything else. It does not matter what, just anything else.

The sneaky backdoor way that professional women have filled in the conservative ranks has not seemed to raise any eyebrows at all. We see female candidates on the ballot for every possible political position. No one blinks an eye. In Washington state, during the last election, they had two women running for the same senate seat. No option for the traditional voter there. That is the part that is so insid-

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

ious. The traditional family is not only under attack, it has the door to its salvation blocked by women who claim to be in support of it. Like Cruella DeVile, they are willing to skin the nearly helpless in order to further their own personal aims. Proudly they claim to be conservative while their very presence there is spitting upon that which must be conserved.

Where can we find the help we so badly need to prop up the falling walls of our marriages? How can we generate the support required to pull our families together for life instead of only until divorce wrecks them? We will not find it among the conservative feminists. Instead there we will find examples and efforts pointing in the absolutely wrong direction, made even more despicable by their presence in the so called conservative ranks beside men who should know better.⁵⁵

“FEMINISM: THE AMERICAN INVASION” (5 JULY 1999)

I am asked why I should deny women their right to work. It is interesting that supporters of the feminist movement would ask such a question. There is no place on this entire web page where I suggest that women should be denied the right to work. I have not suggested that laws be passed which force women to stay out of the workplace. I have not demanded that all women should be restricted to their homes by law. In fact, my only demand, as pertains to women and the workplace is the exact opposite! I demand that the government get out of the area all together!

It is government interference that is the ENTIRE problem with feminism. Back in the 1960s and early 1970s most women never wanted to go to work. They would have just loved to have a nice homemaking position with a loving and faithful husband. If the government had of stayed out of it, there never would have been a feminist problem.

What happened in the early days, was that the society reacted to feminism with disgust. Women said, “There is no way that I would be a feminist.” It was nearly universal! Women wanted no part of being a “women’s libber.” How did we move from that political position, to the one where today most women are living the “libber” lives and think that it is normal? Many of them still think that they are not feminists as they go to their jobs each morning after drop-

ping their kids off at the day care center. That sort of revolution in perception is amazing. How did it happen?

First of all the media cranked up the propaganda machine. They started slanting their news stories in favor of feminism. When anyone suggested that a story had a “women’s point of view” aspect to it, they ran out to get a quote from the National Organization of Women, a small and insignificant group of hard core man haters. Over time that began to mold the soft brains of the television watching public. Then they started dropping in television sitcoms like “That Girl,” and “The Mary Tyler Moore Show,” to make the women’s libbers appear to have a friendly face. It was like a bombing mission to soften up the resistance for the full scale ground invasion. Perhaps the greatest of these softening up weapons used by the future conquerors of this country was, “All in the Family.” In that show all the traditional American points of view were very skillfully cut to ribbons every week in such an entertaining way that more Americans came back to watch that show each week than any other during the time. In the area of feminism, Archie Bunker’s wife, Edith, was shown as a dumb slave with virtually no mind or purpose, except to grab Archie anything his heart desired. After weeks, months, and years of watching the Archie propaganda machine at work, Americans were softened up enough to bring in the troops.

The Supreme Court, the elite Delta Force unit for the invaders, threw out all American tradition, as well as previous court decisions, as they restructured America. They went through the traditional American structure like a fire in an old wooden building. Most areas that they destroyed are subjects for other web pages, but in the area of feminism the direction they were heading was clear.

There was a ruling that female reporters would be allowed by law into male locker rooms after sporting events. The first reaction to this by the vast majority of Americans was, “They can’t be serious!” It was complete astonishment at the absurdity of such an idea. Americans were a more or less prudish people who traditionally would not conceive of a lady even wanting to be in a men’s locker room, let alone having the law forcing the morals of the society to be cast aside in this way. It was not the last time that Americans would be shocked by the intrusive Supreme Court. It did not take long before there was a big scandal where a football player exposed himself to a female reporter in his own locker room and made some

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

comment, which caused a hypocritical major uproar in the media -- the same media which had authored the event in the first place.

There next were rulings that the traditional all male "men's clubs" were no longer allowed. Since it excluded women, and business might be discussed, they were disallowed. Think of the infringement on personal freedom that this entailed! Once again the American people were astounded! Where were these Supreme Court rulings coming from? Where indeed? Obviously they were not coming from the constitution which had predated them by nearly 200 years and no Court had seen that sort of silliness embodied in that document previously. It was just as obvious that the court was not following public opinion, which was against their rulings.

The unfortunate thing was that Americans were trusting of their government. They assumed that the government was of the people, for the people, and by the people. But oh they were so wrong! They found out too late that the government had been taken over by those who thought they knew what the people needed better than the people themselves knew. Instead of finding out what the people wanted, and then doing it, they set out to do what they themselves thought best for the American people, and then force the American people to like it, or at least accept it. That is what oppression and tyranny is all about: forcing the government's will upon its people. We lost our representative republic completely at that point in our history. Franklin D. Roosevelt weakened its foundation nearly to the fatal point, but the 1960s completely removed it.

So, while the people who were raised to respect their government and to trust their leaders were being vandalized and robbed of their freedoms, there was no revolt, as would have been appropriate. The media was the primary reason for that. The media put out a soothing patter of sweet sounding phrases as to how evil the traditional America was and how wonderful the new America was. It was not as crass as that. They used very professional phrasing, but that was the message then, and they continue it today with even greater vigor.

Once they were warmed up, they were ready to get down to some serious pitching. Next they had to soften up the workplace to make it palatable to the women they were forcing into it. The average woman of the 1960s would have been disgusted and shocked by the language, pictures and other masculine trappings that the normal

workplace was filled with. Rather than doing the right thing and telling the women to, "take it or leave it," the court decided to reach its iron fist out once again and demand that men no longer could act like men at work. They could no longer put pictures on the walls that women did not approve of. They could no longer use the same language or tell the same jokes at work, as they had. Their freedom to be themselves was gone, taken by the court.

Again, each of these court rulings met with complete surprise and shock on the part of the American people. Each time it happened the people looked in disbelief, and assumed that finally the tyrannical flood high water mark of this foolishness had been reached. But alas there is no such thing as a high water mark with these totalitarians. They want it all.

Then came the real plunge. The law suits against companies which had a policy to hire men with families over single women, or women who had a working husband. It was decided that the companies were not smart enough or as caring and feeling as our totalitarian overlords, and therefore they should not be in charge of their own hiring policy. Instead, the government would decide for them. The courts ruled that companies, especially large companies would have to hire a certain number of women, or they would have to pay huge fines. This is the exact opposite of freedom and most Americans at the time knew it. They were shocked! But over time the ability to be shocked is diminished.

As a brief aside, we saw the same process in miniature with the Clinton presidency. He was accused of doing something that nearly all agreed, including most members of his own Democratic Party, would be grounds for throwing him out of office if it were true. "However," we were told, "We must wait until the evidence is in before passing judgement." Then, while it took a year to produce the evidence, the entire story is leaked out a little at a time, and the shock value is completely gone by the time the Senate trial hits. The accusation turned out to be completely true, BUT all of the people whose judgement was sound a year before, had been anesthetized over a year of hearing about it. Comments were made, "There is nothing new in the Starr Report." It was as if only newness would be acceptable grounds for discipline, and of course newness was impossible, therefore discipline was impossible.

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

As the feminist shocks were having less impact, the process began speeding up. In the media there were no more shows being made that represented real life. Men, even today, are doing the bulk of the military fighting and the policing of our cities but television shows do not represent that. Television shows lay on the feminist “ideal” with gusto. The American people do not even realize that they are having their attitudes adjusted with this propaganda.

Let's take a quick look at a barometer of how effective this propaganda has been. The 1984 movie *The Terminator* showed a normal, feminine girl being chased by a nearly indestructible robot from the future. At the end of the movie she was pregnant, and as a concerned mother-to-be, she was going to a safe place to have her son and to raise him. After 7 years pass, the feminists were feeling more secure in their propaganda campaign, and in 1991 that once sweet, feminine, normal girl had become in *Terminator II - Judgement Day* some lesbian's dream of a butch lover. No reaction from the audiences! People just do not shock very easily anymore.

The courts have gone so far as to dictate the power structure inside a company. A company cannot make up its own standards as to how it will hire or promote. It must follow the court's dictates. It must hire the right kind of people, which does not in any way mean the kind of people who would make the company more profitable! It must promote people, not based upon company determined criteria but by court ordered criteria. That does not sound like a free society to me.

Probably the most shocking maneuver by the liberal invasion force was the legalizing of abortion. Americans nearly universally were opposed to abortion before the Supreme Court passed the death sentence on at least 30 million children in this nation. (The number grows by more than a million a year if you can even imagine that kind of slaughter. At this rate, those who support the right to “choose” will soon pass up the communists as the worst mass murderer of all time.) Again it was not the people who wanted this outrage. It was not the constitution which supported this outrage. It was the will of the tyrants and no other.

The next phase could be called the Consolidation Phase. All government agencies were immediately forced to aggressively hire and promote women, and if you have the misfortune of having to deal with any government agency you will almost certainly be deal-

ing with one or more of the tyrants' chosen ones. (e.g. I once had access to the NASA channel and watched a few of their lectures. It appeared that virtually 100% of their lecturers were women.) After loading up all the agencies directly controlled by the government with the specially chosen people, they started working on the volunteer military force. The standards of the military made it impossible to ever get women in large numbers into the military so they dropped the standards, thereby lowering the ability of the military to protect our country. Of course the Feminist Invaders hardly could be concerned about something as unimportant as that.

The most important, and to any real American the saddest, part of the Consolidation Phase has been the brainwashing of our children. From the television shows that they grow up on, to the classrooms that we pay for with out tax dollars, our children are bombarded with feminist propaganda. They are told that women are the same as men and should have the same role in society. The average woman or man of the 1960s would have been outraged by that, but today the propaganda has worked. Today, our children are freely given over, by their parents, to the people who shape little brains into liberal feminists. There is hardly a whimper any longer. In fact women have been so brainwashed today that, while they live their feminist lives, they do not even realize that they are feminists. They often claim that they are not! It is clear that the Consolidation Phase has been a success.

The only fly in the ointment for the tyrants today is the Internet. They have successfully blocked all dissent by any traditionalist via the newspapers, the television, and the classroom. They have a great deal of control over the radio too, despite the "conservative" talk show hosts. (The term "conservative" is a joke anymore. What are they "conserving"? They are conserving the left wing agenda of the 1960s! It is ridiculous that they even have the name conservative.) Here on the Internet free speech still abounds. The tyrants hate it mind you, but it is here for now. You have these overlords sponsoring companies in a mad dash to create filtering programs to be used, we are told, by your web browser, in order to save "the children" from XXX material. In reality what they want is to filter out is traditional political thought. If a web page today were to list, in a positive light, all of the beliefs in detail of the average American of the 1950s, it would be filtered out by one of those programs. If the

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

thoughts of our Founding Fathers were presented today on certain subjects, you can rest assured, a filtered computer would not be able to reach that site. The day will come when the average American browsing the Internet, will be as controlled as the average television watcher is today. But that time has not yet come! We must "make hay while the sun shines."

So, if you are a feminist, remember that it is you who have forced, and are forcing, your views upon our people, not me trying to force my views upon you! My attempts to remove the foot of the tyrants from off of my neck, is not an attempt to put my foot on your neck. My only demand is for feminism to stand on its own two feet instead of having a totalitarian government enforce its ideas upon the unwilling.

If the new direction, that the country has taken since the 1960s, seems to you to be correct, then you are on the wrong web page. You and I have nothing in common. If, on the other hand, you think that America was actually better before the invasion of the tyrants. Stick around you might enjoy yourself.⁵⁶

"A LEFTIST REPLY" (1 FEBRUARY 2000)

I received the following email in response to my article Feminism: The American Invasion. I decided to put it up along with my replies to show what we are up against in our society today.

As a teacher who cares about options and futures available to both males and females, I find your "rant" particularly disturbing.

Ah, the heart of liberalism speaks. It is hardly surprising that the "teacher" is coming down on the side of the egalitarian Leftists. See how pleasant it sounds to be Leftist. You always "care." You are always looking out for folks. You are ready to sacrifice anything and everything for the sake of caring, especially the rights and freedom of every other member of society. It's okay though because you "care."

And what is it that you are willing to sacrifice our freedom for? "Options and futures available to both males and females." That is a very amusing distortion of the facts. You care not for the options

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

and futures available to men at all. And you only care about the options and futures available to Leftist women, women who want to desperately to become men. The average woman, who would like to be home with her children you couldn't care less about. If her dream is crushed you celebrate it because it is one less traditionalist getting in the way of your phoney "utopia."

Now that the Left has a lock on nearly all forms of mass communication they do indeed find any sort of dissent voiced in opposition to their position to their power "disturbing." The very idea that someone just might think for themselves, rather than march to the drum of the party line, why it is outrageous!

Once again we are treated to a male who appears to be unable to understand the nature of the Women's Liberation Movement (not "lib" movement.)

It is gratifying to realize that you find myself such a treat to encounter. Still, your perception is obviously distorted, for I do not in actuality, nor appearance, misunderstand the feminist movement at all, no matter what you choose to call it. I simply point out the fact that the "emperor has no clothes," which collapses the power of your fairy tale.

It is simply a political and social movement whose goal is the opening of an opportunity structure for women of all situations.

There is nothing simple about the feminist movement. As soon as anyone tries to claim that it is simply anything, you know they are trying to pull the wool over your eyes. It is interesting to see the various ways that oppression can be made to sound palatable. Here we find that it is an "opportunity structure for women of all situations." When a company is sued into submission it is merely creating an "opportunity structure." And what is that structure created out of? Why the debris produced by the dismantling of our freedom, and nothing else. And the dishonesty of saying it is for "women of all situations" is so absurd that one wonders how anyone can still have the gall to put that sort of nonsense forward with a straight face. The homemaker who wanted nothing but to be a good wife and mother, is forced out of the home and into the market place by this move-

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

ment. Her husband has been warped by the political propaganda put forward by teachers such as this, and insists that she go out and work, like all the other women are doing. The government has found it easier to raise taxes because of this process and now all of the woman's pay is taken by Uncle Sam, and the family has lost its mother in order to feed the Leftist political machine. Very nice for those "caring" people. But it is a tragedy for the children who have been abandoned in the process.

There is nothing sadder than seeing a girl come to the realization that her chances of pursuing any future are limited because of her gender.

This is absurd. Class, here is a simple assignment that will show this statement to be false on the face of it: take a pencil and number on your paper from one to ten. Now list beside each number, one thing sadder than having a limited future in the workplace. I will do number one for you. A girl finds out that she has cancer and will be dead in six months. That should appear sadder, even to a feminist. I am sure that the rest of the list will be just as easy for you to compile.

Moving beyond that, it grows tiresome to hear feminists speak of people being limited by the facts of life, as if that were a bad thing. Men are limited in what they can do as well. (Not that you care a bit about that!) Men cannot go up to a prospective employer and say, "You must hire me because I am a man." They have never been able to do that. The very idea of it is absurd. Men have always had to prove themselves worthy of the job and even then they often did not get the position. Intellect, physical prowess, and yes, even gender are valid limiting factors in many occupations. It is time that we stopped being so sad over that fact and once again move into reality.

Lastly, the feminist never sheds any tears over the poor woman who wants to be a homemaker. NEVER! It is not sad to them if she has that dream ripped from her by a society that has no use for those who would create the next generation of civilized human beings.

Government had nothing to do with the emergence of this movement.

This is so far from the truth that it is outrageous! If the government had not become involved first, through the courts, and later through the legislative process, there would be no feminist movement as we know it. Oh sure the lesbians would run around and bellyache that they did not fit into normal society, but nobody would care. It has been the government enforcing feminism that has made it the destructive force that it is today. I remember the sixties. The vast majority of women made a point of saying openly that they were not "Women's Libbers". It was not a popular movement that merely caught on to the masses. It was forced upon us through the government and media propaganda.

I believe that the collective behavior of men towards women produced the conditions from which a heightened sensitivity to women's issues developed.

Of course everyone is entitled to their own belief system. However, what you fail to point out is that no societal system is perfect, and the Leftist has always used imperfection as a wedge for his oppressive view. He always cries out for the "revolution" as if it were going to be pure heaven after he takes over. All during the sixties we heard this refrain, on several fronts. The Leftist was going to make life so much better for woman and everyone. It was far more difficult to sell that lie in America than it was in Russia. In the early 1900s, Russia lived in a poorer society, which was more oppressive under the Czar. In America during the 1950s we had freedom, we had wealth, we had solid families, the BEST schools in the world, a low crime rate, with the accompanying safe neighborhoods, and of course a very bright future before us. The Leftist had to try and find a way to make the very best society that had ever existed on planet earth to appear lacking and in need of change. Without help they could never have pulled it off.

What imperfection did the Leftist find to use against us? Why "the collective behavior of men towards women." Most women of the 1950s were living in luxury that few woman had ever dreamed of in previous centuries. They had nice homes, happy families and many new devices to make the work of caring for the house much easier for them. They had many fellow mothers to associate with, and to help supervise the children during the day, and things had never been better, for such a large portion of women, who had ever

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

lived in any society before. The collective behavior of men was, at that time, to go out and work for their families, paying the bills and staying around to help support and raise the children for life.

To show the Leftist hypocrisy for what it is, what has been the result of the feminist movement upon this superb 1950s society? Today, men and women are divorced almost routinely. Very few marriages last throughout even the childrearing years, let alone through life. Women are forced into the workplace, and through the accompanied side effect of divorce, they are left with having to work full time and in addition to that, try to do the full time job of homemaker, all by themselves. Children no longer have to worry as they "wait till their fathers gets home" if they act up, and so they just act up more. In the teen years they often become very troubling, and even criminal. The one option that the vast majority of women wanted to be able to choose, that of being a good and happy homemaker, has been taken from them, and the Leftist smiles and says, "See what we have done for you?"

That shows clearly that feminism is not about "women's issues." NOW does not speak for women. It speaks for Leftist women only. When a feminist speaks of "women's" issues, he is speaking of issues that only concern Leftist women. Feminists do not care about women. They only care about their agenda, and promoting the destructive ideals of feminism. If killing three quarters of our wonderful women would accomplish that agenda, they would not hesitate to do it. (This was demonstrated during the Carter administration when the feminists were pushing hard to create a female draft, to force unwilling women into dangerous military service.)

What government actually did, however, was to remove (through law) men's options of limiting the futures of women and it brought the status of women into more direct compliance with the constitution.

It never ceases to amaze me that Leftists even refer to the constitution as if it were a document that they valued at all. Every one of their actions is directed at destroying the constitution and then they hold it up and say, "See how much we love the constitution." If you cared a whit about the constitution you would look at what the writers of that constitution practiced, and the laws that they created under it. You will notice that feminism played no part whatsoever in

that arena. Women did not have the vote, and there were no laws which tried to limit the freedom of businessmen to run THEIR OWN BUSINESSES as they saw fit. Freedom was the intent, and liberty was the result of our constitution.

So, is it fair, accurate or honest to claim that what has transpired over the last 40 years has brought us into "more direct compliance with the constitution?" It is clear that we have moved in direct defiance of the constitution and its spirit. If society wishes to open the door of its businesses to women, then that is society's choice to make, not the government's. Since the constitution writers did not intend for government to interfere in such matters, obviously your claim that such interference is in line with the constitution is absurd. The constitution was intended to tie the government's hand, and to limit the power it has, so that it could not do what it has been doing recently: oppressing the people.

It is easy to come up with nice sounding excuses for oppression. Just think how fair it would be if we took all the money in the United States and just handed it out equally to all the people. Everyone is equally valuable, and so why shouldn't everyone have exactly the same amount of money? Oh, yes, it is easy to make oppression sound wonderful as the feminists do, but the results of their actions speak louder than all their rhetoric.

Men could no longer treat women with impunity. What a radical idea that women should be extended the same rights as men!

You mean what an absurd idea that women should be extended the same rights as men. Since men and women are different, they have different needs. If the same rights were extended to both sexes, women would, by definition have to be drafted into the military just like men, otherwise men would not the same rights as women. In divorces men would have to have custody of the children as often as woman. The right to a gender specific restroom would be null and void, for what if a man were to continue a business conversation in the restroom, leaving a woman out of it? Women right now are treated differently than men in many ways, by our legal system, and our society. They are treated better in many ways, than men. That is as it should be. If your assertion were taken seriously all of the special consideration for women would instantly disappear, and any

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

legal issue that was considered "women's" would of course be cast aside as ridiculous for there would be no legal differences between two genders that have equal rights.

In a democracy such as ours, you do not have the right to limit anyone for any reason whatsoever.

Really? So, you are saying that I should be able to walk into a company and insist that they give me the CEO position along with the associated paycheck today. If you say no, you are limiting me and according to you, you have no such right. How is it that Leftists can get away with saying such stupid things in public? It is amazing to me.

Of course I have the right to create any limits I choose within my company. If I wish to hire only left-handed redheads, that is my constitutional (as originally written and understood) right! Neither you nor anyone else (especially the US government) has the right to tell me who to hire or promote in a business that I create from my own invested capitol. If I choose to limit women in my business then in a free society I have that right. If I choose to hire only women, I have that right. It is none of the government's business either way. It is a sign of how eagerly you support oppression that you are willing to throw out everyone's freedom in order for the government to make someone else follow your political agenda. That is not American, it is anti-American.

I still do not understand how some men are unable to see the obvious patterns of discrimination existing "out there," weather it be gender, racial, age, religious or whatever.

Of course, there are patterns of discrimination "out there." Nobody fails to see that. What you fail to see is that patterns of discrimination are a good thing! If you look at the Physics department in any major university, you have blatant discrimination going on. You will find that every member of the staff knows a great deal about physics and if a prospective employee doesn't, he will be discriminated against. If he has a low IQ he will be left out. That is what I want in my university! You should too. Discrimination means that you have some standard and you follow it. It is as simple as that, and every business has a right to set their own standard of

discrimination. That is what a free society is all about. If you can come up with a better standard of discrimination than your competitor, and thereby hire a more productive workforce then you win the business game. Again, that is what a free society is all about. If a group of people are capable and left out by one business then they can either find another business or start their own. That too is what a free society is all about. The one thing that a free society is not about, and in fact cannot survive in the presence of, is government control of your actions. Never forget that freedom means being able to make stupid and wrong choices, as well as intelligent and correct choices. If the government makes your choices for you, you are no longer free.

When people tell us that their lives are unsatisfactory, it is up to us to listen and do what we can to improve the situation.

If you are a charity that may be true, but not a society. A society can choose for itself what it will listen to and what it will attempt to fix. It is up to the individual to fix his own life if it is unsatisfactory. Only in a totalitarian society, are people forced into taking care of others whom they would otherwise choose not to. In America the vast majority of people have always held their own future in their hands. It is up to them to make that future bright or dark. It is not the government's role to take care of people like they are some sort of undeveloped children.

Creating an evil government notion is not the way.

The government, any government, is a necessary evil. Ours is growing larger, and therefore more evil, every day. The Founding Fathers clearly understood this basic principle, when they set up the constitution to limit the government, and to keep it from doing what it is doing today. They believed that a government was a necessary evil, but it was inherently oppressive. The only solution to that problem is to keep the government small, and to limit the scope of what it is involved with. It is not merely some notion, but rather it is a fact, that as our government has grown larger, it has become more intrusive. It is attempting to control more of our daily lives, in addition to taking more of our pay checks to feed its oppressive self.

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

The totalitarianism you see is actually a constitutionally enforced set of rules you (by virtue of your citizenship) have agreed to live by.

No, the totalitarianism that exists, and therefore I see, is a radical departure from the constitution, which is a set of limitations upon the government that you refuse to acknowledge, or see. The constitution is a set of rules for the government, not for me. Laws must conform to the limits of the constitution. Government institutions must conform to the constitution. That is my protection from people like you who gain political power and want to run my life as you see fit.

Those "rules" are simply telling you that you can not act in ways which oppress people.

The "rules" of the constitution state that the GOVERNMENT cannot oppress people. It is amazing how you Leftists have managed to turn the correct role of our constitution in our society, into something the exact opposite of what it really is. The constitution says nothing about how I must act at all. It only says how the government must act, and it specifically opposes the types of oppressive measures you are promoting!

Is there some honor in being oppressive (e.g., the name "cave-man.")

You should ask yourself that question. There is however, a great honor in standing against oppressive thought control (hence the name "caveman"). As the Leftist's grip is tightened upon our lives, it becomes ever more important that men AND WOMEN who hate what you stand for, let themselves be heard in a way that shakes up the Politically Correct mantra that is being broadcast daily from a thousand sources.

Maybe if you joined with women in achieving their liberation, you also would benefit from their gains.

The scary thing is that you probably really believe that. The average woman has made no gains at all. She has lost what is most

dear to her: her family. She now lives a lonely life, of being a divorced woman with children, struggling to make ends meet, without even a husband to share her life's walk with. Her children grow up, not nurtured at her knee, but as nearly strangers, on their own. I am completely disgusted by the feminist continually proclaiming this sad deterioration of women's lives as "progress" or "gains".

Wouldn't you like to see, for example, average life expectancy for males increase?

The average male lives a good long life, into his seventies. A couple of more years of existences would in no way justify the destruction of our society, by the abandonment, or abortion, of our children.

After all, if society is able to enjoy the benefits of the resources which women bring to the table, we will all be better off, don't you think?

The thing that feminists like you do not understand, or choose to ignore, is that society itself would not exist if it were not for the resources that women have brought to the table all along! You wish to squander those resources on the masculine world of the workplace and remove them from the feminine world of the home. In the home the mother wraps her love around her children like no other on person on earth could possibly do. She will care and nurture those children, as they need. That is why the female mind and personality is so different from the male's, because they have nurtured children for thousands and thousand of years. No day care, or babysitter can replace that. The female resource of motherhood is irreplaceable. If you submit to me that women are better than men at business I would have to call you a liar, because even you know that is not true. If all women left the work place to never return, life would go on in the business world. There would be a bump as they reorganized, but it would not take long before you would think that things were always all-male in the work place. But something else would happen in our society that would be absolutely priceless. Suddenly our children would be loved and cared for in a way that has not happened in 2 generations. You would see a renaissance in educational performance of those children. You would see a drop in

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

crime and drugs. Children would once again learn to be respectful members of society. The world we live in would be radically changed for the better as we once again, as we did in the past, relish "the benefits of the resources which women bring to the table," and we would indeed all be better off for it.

Sorry for my "rant." Rock On.

John

No reason to apologize for ranting. I always welcome the opportunity to point out the fallacies of those who wish to oppress us.⁵⁷

"THE HIDDEN FACTOR" (14 FEBRUARY 2000)

The net effect of feminism is to make any population that practices it, dumber. The overall IQ of any population practicing feminism, will over time become lower. Why is that? Because the women with high IQ's of any such society will be drawn into the feminist web, and they will fail to reproduce at even a replacement rate.

What is it about feminism that seeks out and destroys intelligence? Here are a few factors:

- One of the primary goals of feminism is to promote the freeing of women from the "mundane" task of raising children. Feminism has set as one of its goals: zero children for women; a goal which is of course suicidal, but that does not slow them down.
- Should a woman, who practices the religion of feminism, become pregnant, she will be encouraged by her fellow feminists to have an abortion, and terminate the child's life within her.
- Women who are feminists, are driven to have careers. So, even if they want to have children, they view that as something to be done later, and to be done quickly. In other words, they will have only one, or at the most two children, if they get around to it at all. If they fail to have this attitude, they fear that the childbearing process will destroy their careers.
- Women who do the best in school, the most intelligent, will be the most sought after by the feminist clergy who dominated the school system. These bright young women, will be pushed and directed away from any thoughts of being a wife and mother as a career. They will be pounded with rhetoric, and lies, about how terrible past women had it, and how important it is that they not

give in and "go traditional." By the time they have finished college they have been through a top quality brainwashing campaign, and it is very unlikely that they will be able to overcome it on their own.

What happens when all of the brightest young ladies fail to have children? It will leave only the less intelligent women to shoulder the burden of carrying on the most important task of all: creating the next generation. Women who are not doing well in school, do not draw the feminist sharks to them. They are allowed to proceed on their own course, and the Leftist propaganda, framed for confusing the intelligent mind into acceptance, passes lesser minds by. These woman, who often make wonderful mothers, will go out into the world and they will have families, as they should. However the higher IQ ladies are lost to the gene pool.

If you think about it, it is the equivalent of an enemy army coming into a country and shooting all of the most intelligent men in the country. Those high IQ individuals will have their genes removed from the gene pool, and the next generation will be that much dumber than the previous generation. Being done generation after generation, the results of this feminist sifting process will accumulate over time. As it runs its course, there will be fewer and fewer intelligent people in each generation.

In America today, thanks to Leftist philosophy in general, and feminism specifically, the best and brightest in our society are reproducing at a level well below the replacement level of 2.1 children. (The *replacement level* is the number of children, on average a group of families must have in order for that group to maintain its current population and to replace itself.) In fact the latest number I have heard is they are producing 1.5 children on average.

Besides having dismantled our world class school system, the Leftists are now stealing our most intelligent children from the future generations by promoting the feminist religion to the members of our society. We will slowly but surely be forced into being a dumb, uneducated people who will be only too happy to reside in the third world society that is planned for our future.

Taking genetic inheritance into consideration, would halt feminism in its tracks. What our society should be doing is to encourage the most intelligent women to reproduce in as large numbers as is physically possible, rather than hanging a "Condemned for a Ca-

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

reer" sign over their womb. By having high IQ women producing large families we would raise the average IQ of the next generation. That means we would increase the standard of living for that new generation, because standard of living is directly tied to IQ. There are studies which show that criminal behavior is tied to lower IQ and that people with higher IQs are more likely to be law abiding citizens. So, by chucking feminism out the door, for the next generation, we can raise the intelligence, the standard of living, and at the same time lower the crime rate.

Of course that will not mean anything to the average feminist. They are not interested in future generations, or else they would not support abortion, which has killed more young citizens of future America than there are people in the entire country of Canada. Feminists are only interested in power for themselves. Everything else is mere trapping, and window dressing. People like that are not open to reason. They are not sympathetic to other's difficulties. They are focused on their own selfish gain, not America's future.

What are you focused on? The Leftist, Marxist view of "equality" that drove the Soviet Union into the horrors of mass exterminations, and bankruptcy? Or the "inequality" of America that built this great land, and produced long term marriages, the best schools in the world, and the freest society for men and women that has ever existed? Since 1960 we have been rapidly moving towards the Soviet model and leaving our American model farther and farther behind. Our marriages have broken up, our schools have fallen into decay, and our freedom has been squeezed into an ever more restrictive box.

Those who support feminism do not care. The Leftists are celebrating the negative changes that have come upon our society. They do not feel robbed by the loss of freedom. They do not shed a tear over the collapse of our schools. They do not fret at all over the complete fragmentation of our homes. They applaud the enforcement of their agenda upon all others, as if totalitarian action is just fine. They can justify any outlandish action by "spinning" the motive to where it sounds "caring."

Do you know where this is heading? The Marxist will not be satisfied with merely pushing feminist ideals down your throat with a billy club. If you have paid attention at all during the last few presidential elections, they are quite intent on removing financial forms

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

of inequality too. "Caring" people will no longer accept the concept that rich people should have rich privileges, like living in a big house, or driving a nice car. That is not "fair" to the Marxist. He who produces has no claim on more privilege than he who fails to produce. We are all human and therefore we all should live at the same standard of living: dirt poor. We have seen this all before in Russia and we should be smart enough to tell these Leftist Stalinist clones, to shove off. Freedom was what made America great, not Marxism!

Every time you give up some of your freedom, in order to promote "fairness" you are putting one more chain on. Every time you take another step to the Left, you are one step closer to the gulag. We have already gone a long ways down this road to destruction. We must wake up and turn around soon. It should scare all Americans to think that they have a president in the White House who actually has tried to nationalize our medical system. You can find excuses for nationalizing every industry in America if you want to, and believe me, the Leftists want to! The only protection from such abuses is to put our collective foot down and nationalize no industries. We must find our own solutions to problems, without the federal government. Or we will become the enslaved people of yet one more oppressive totalitarian state.

In the mean time, think about what is happening to our future, as feminism drains the intelligence out of the gene pool. Soon, we will be too stupid to realize that we are enslaved.⁵⁸

"MORALITY?" (26 NOVEMBER 2000)

A reader recently told me that I should, "Take a break from the attack on Feminism and write an article on the benefits of morality." He also felt, considering my example of Major League Baseball and the introduction of Black players because of their ability, that removing all women from the workplace was not realistic and that some women could actually do the job. The following is my reply to these items, in reverse order.

I actually do not think removing all women from the work place is doable. First of all, some women have nearly always had a role in helping to run family businesses, and other things. Some hard cases have been involved with science, and even mechanics, and other

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

masculine endeavors all along. That is of no importance to me. Our society will not be seriously impacted by the few women who can competently interface with the workplace. It is the vast majority of women who cannot so easily mesh with the masculine world, where the problem lies.

If 10% of women go to work and 90% of women stay at home and keep our families together, all will be well with the world. That will guarantee that the next generation of children will be properly raised and our society will have the opportunity to continue to flower and grow. Trying to pry the last 10% of women out of the workplace would be counterproductive, wasting our efforts, and creating no further benefit. In fact those women would be lousy wives and mothers anyway, and are better kept busy and out of harm's way, as they were before 1960.

It is not women of course, but rather the government interfering in the process, that is the danger. The government did not force Black players into sports! Those men could play sports, and it was to the advantage of the teams to hire them, so they did. The same cannot be said concerning the governmental affirmative action programs, that force employers to hire people that are not qualified simply because they fall into some favored group. Hiring a woman because of her gender is discrimination, not based upon merit but upon an arbitrarily enforced "standard" created by a totalitarian minded group of people. This is the source of evil in feminism, and this is where our efforts must be directed against if we are to cure the curse of feminism.

You cannot through reason alone, convince enough people that feminism is a bad idea, to be able to vote it out of existence. Why? Because you do not have the resources that the Leftists do. You do not control the media. And he who controls the mass media, controls a democratic government. The average voter will watch his television, and "learn" what is right and wrong, and vote accordingly. It has been going on for decades. The majority of voters (which is all it takes to control a democracy) do not think. They do not even vote in their own best interests. If they vote at all, they vote what they think will be acceptable to their peers, based upon what they hear through the heavily filtered media. It should frighten Americans to death to know that the same people who are creating the filth and perversion called "entertainment" shown today in mov-

ies, and on television, are controlling our government. But in fact, that is the case.

I find it amusing to see "liberals" driving around with "Kill Your Television" bumper stickers on their cars. If people ever did actually put their televisions in the dumpster where they belong, the Leftists would be thrown out of power in a very short time, and these little thoughtless liberal clones would be heartbroken by the result.

Today the Internet is the only mass communication outlet available to those who are politically incorrect. Even that avenue is heavily under attack. Congress is being inundated with pleas for "hate speech" legislation from the enemies of free speech, in order to outlaw our most precious right. Once "hate speech" is outlawed, it doesn't take much of an imagination to see that anything that the government does not want said, will magically become "hate speech."

Those who would like to shut me up, call me a "hater." I stand for "freedom to choose" for the employer. I stand for freedom to hire and promote based upon an employers wants and needs, rather than an imposed regulation from a government grown fat and oppressive. That means that I do not promote "equal opportunity," above freedom of employer choice. Therefore, it is said that I promote "discrimination," and that is "hate." Even though I love women and I want women to be happy, I am said to "hate" women. That is a lie, but one that keeps being repeated.

The only thing that stands between my web page and the Leftist self-appointed censors, is the First Amendment. If only they could get rid of that irritating constitutional thorn from under their saddle, then they could outlaw my ideas, and prosecute anyone who should speak out in favor of them. These anti-freedom people have had great success in Germany and other European countries, where you can now be sent to jail for expressing certain ideas. They are hard at work here in the USA as well. Keep your eyes open, and every time you hear the term "hate" being thrown around, remember that it is a code word for censorship of ideas. We have always had laws against inciting riots or violence, but before this we never tried to outlaw ideas, no matter how unpopular they might be. Now, we have great efforts being made to outlaw any idea that is politically incorrect. The "hate" censors start with the ideas that few people agree with,

and then work their way towards the center, in their efforts to control the masses.

As much of a supporter of morality as I am, unfortunately I must say that morality is what got us into this mess. The American people allowed their feelings of "fair play" and "moral" treatment of others to cloud their judgment, as they were saturated with propaganda from the Left (which has no sense of morality whatsoever). We were told that injustices existed, and the prescribed remedy was to destroy our society. (It was not phrased exactly that way, but looking back, that is exactly what they meant!) All the problems with families in our society at that time were said to be the fault of traditional marriage. The Leftist said that women were "oppressed" and that they must be allowed to have careers. Instead of trying to fix the system we had, and to work out the few, and relatively insignificant problems that did exist in our marriages (which the vast majority of lasted until death separated the participants!), the moral and fair minded citizens of this nation were told that they had to disassemble the entire thing and start over, with women in the workplace being the most important aspect of the new system. The least important aspects of the new system would be the children, and the family. And in the name of "morality" and "fairness," we did the most immoral and unfair thing possible to our women, our children, and our nation.

Have you ever noticed the number of times Bill Clinton appeals to "morality" to justify his despicable activities? The Communists have always been that way. They buff up their arguments and their false fronts to appear to the masses as if they are walking tall and proud on the high moral ground. They appeal to morality. They point to honor and righteousness, while in their dark hearts they have no love for either. I feel the average citizen is not so much deficient in morality, as he is in knowledge and correct perspective. I think the average citizen is eager to do the right thing. Where he is led onto the path of destruction is through his input channels. Garbage in and garbage out, works just as effectively with a human as it does with a computer. And our people are being fed tons of garbage every day, through their televisions and newspapers.

The Internet is like a candle in a dry field of grass. One of two things is going to happen. If it is allowed to ignite the grassroots, a firestorm of action would result. If on the other hand the enemies of

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

freedom and free speech are allowed to blow it out, we are as doomed as Winston Smith was in Orwell's 1984.

Feminism is only one of the heads of the multi-headed beast that has attacked our nation, and disassembled so much of what we had before 1960. Our children are no longer educated or even safe in the school buildings that our tax dollars pay for. We have to import people, from other lands, in order to fill high tech jobs that our kids no longer are educated well enough to fill. All of this is a direct result of the attack from the Left during, and since, the 1960s. And all of it was made possible by our citizens standing by and watching, because they were told that it was necessary to do so, because it was the moral and right thing to do. It was NOT the moral thing. It was absolutely the **WRONG** thing to do, but even to this day most "conservatives" think that the country was changed in a positive way by the heartless, amoral, and hateful attack upon our way of life perpetrated by the radical Left during the "hippie era."

If a citizen of the 1950s was magically brought forward to today, he would be happily surprised at the technological advances, but he would be completely appalled at the societal changes for the worse. He would be in a very big hurry to return home where he would be safe from what we are facing. He would be able to see the danger, because he would not have been exposed to decades of propaganda from the media that we have. He would see things for what they are. Where decay exists, he would call it decay, not "progress." Where we today we are a nation divided and growing ever more so, he would see the attack for what it is. Unfortunately, Americans are so completely conditioned by their nightly sessions with the Leftist box in their living room, they don't have a clue as to what is happening to them and their nation.⁵⁹

"FORCE AND FEMINISM" (20 DECEMBER 2000)

I find it very interesting the way the Left attempts to turn reality around and made it walk backwards. I have been asked why it is that I "want to force my views upon others." Such hypocrisy is hard to fathom. How do you properly address someone who, is either so confused as to be unable to see the irony of their absurd assertion, or is so dishonest so as to have no problem with putting forward a brazen lie?

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

Let us look at that truth of the matter. My position is that the US government has no business getting involved with promoting feminism. On this topic, it has no rightful -- or legal -- place in asserting an opinion, let alone enforcing one upon the population. What our society chooses to do, is up to our society on this issue. If our society wishes to hire women in the workplace, and promote feminist issues and causes, then it has that right. If, on the other hand, our society wishes to ignore feminism, and reject its philosophy, then it has that right. In either case, it is not up to the government, through punitive court rulings and other forms of oppressive government intrusion, to cause the feminist point of view to become the official view, and the legally enforced view, of our society. It is unconstitutional for the government to dictate to us that we will accept the feminist dogma as fact, and put feminist ideas to work in our society under threat of law suit and government fines. We the people, constitutionally have the right to make up our own minds on whether we will accept or reject the ideas of feminism.

Feminists, on the other hand, wish to force their views upon others through the iron fisted tactics of an oppressive government. Through the use of law suits, and government legislation, punitive fines and formidable political pressure brought through the use of the Leftist controlled media, the feminists have enforced their quasi-religious views upon the entire nation. It has become virtually illegal to have a publicly expressed, and/or practiced, corporate view that is directly opposed to feminism. In a land that is still erroneously proclaimed as a "free country" the feminists have been able to openly, and undeniably force their point of view upon us all.

The Leftists think that they know best what is right and wrong. They actually believe that forcing their point of view upon the rest of us is justified because they are "better people" than we, and more "moral" than we. Their ideals are the only possible ideals in their minds, and therefore, no matter what it takes to promote them, is just fine. If they must take your freedom to make you practice their ideals, that is a small price to pay in their eyes. If they destroy your families, and your society in the process, that is just the way it is going to have to be.

As disgusting, and un-American, as the Leftist view is, it is made even more unpalatable by their intense hypocrisy. While they have short-circuited the constitution, and destroyed the freedom of Amer-

ica, and while they have forced all of this land to embrace feminism, in action if not in belief, they still have the gall to derisively claim that those who stand for freedom, the ones who stand for letting people decide for themselves, are "forcing their views on others," while they themselves are not. Has there ever been any greater case of hypocrisy at any time in history? I think not.

While I have stated my case strongly on this web page, and shown why I think that feminism is a terribly destructive force in our society, I have only resorted to persuasion, not to a call for totalitarian government enforcement of my point of view. That means that I am not attempting to force my view upon others, but rather am trying to stop the Leftists from forcing their view upon me, and upon all Americans. It is clear that what the Left is frightened of, is that Americans will see the glaring flaws in the feminist doctrine, and just might rise up and take charge of their own lives again, and throw the Leftists out of power once and for all. They fear open discussion of any topic that they have forced down our throats through government oppression, and will do whatever it takes to shut the opposition up. Whether it is calling their intended victims names, like "sexist," or taking them to court for "discrimination," or for creating a "hostile working environment," the Leftists are intent upon keeping the opposition quiet, and compliant.

It seems quite clear that what Americans must do is to rise up and demand that all government interference in personal affairs such as business hiring, firing, and promotions, etc. will be removed immediately, and then the American society can decide for itself what it wants to do. This idea is a "nightmare come alive" for the Leftist who thinks he is today completely in control of Americans, and their way of life. He will call the idea "hate" and "sexist" as he tries to kill it with bluster, ridicule, and attack. But the simplicity of the idea, and its inherently American flavor, so much in line with what the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence originally stood for, make it nearly indestructible, and impossible to permanently silence. The only way a government can be by, for, and of the people, is if the people are the ones who choose how things are going to be done, not the government.

So, whether you think women should be running the world, or in the home, raising kids, is a secondary issue. What is the primary issue is, whether Americans should be free to decide how they are

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

going to run their own society, or should the government be allowed to force society to mold itself to the Leftist ideals, as has been going on for over 40 years. If we want tyranny, we should be content for it has found us. If, on the other hand, we want freedom once again, we better get up on our feet and do something to take it back.⁶⁰

"WHERE ARE ALL THE MEN?" (28 JUNE 2002)

After 4 decades of stacking the deck in favor of women, and feminizing our educational system, the leftist media, which are more responsible than any other group, agency, or organization on earth -- including the N.O.W. -- for creating the problem, now have the gall to ask, concerning our college graduates, "Where are all the men?"

In a recent article in the Washington Post, it was stated that of the 860 graduates of Morgan State University this year, two-thirds of them were women.

The entire article was an attempt to make it appear as if the Washington Post, an organ of leftist feminist doctrine second to none, actually cared where the men were. As a result, there were some hints in the article as to what has happened to our schools.

"There is still the notion that men should be making their own way," Morgan State University President Earl S. Richardson said. "If they come to campus without money, they want to find a job."

Note the phrasing that Richardson used. It sounds as if it were bad thing for men to want to "make their own way." How dare they avoid dependence upon the government, which the female students embrace so readily? What a quaint and old-fashion way to look at things. Sounds like another action item for the feminists. If only we could take away that independent spirit from men, the problem would just go away. Poses the feminist, "Why can't a man be more like a woman?"

From what Richardson said we can see that women are not forced to pay their own way, to the same extent that men are. Women have financial benefits given to them like candy, from the government, industry, and from their parents. The feminized parents of today are actually more proud of a daughter who graduates from college, and then ends up not using that degree, effectively displacing a male student in the process, than they would have been if she had become a good wife and mother, and helped to create a happy

and healthy family. She may now struggle through her life, get divorced, produce a child or two that she can't care for properly, and work in some field other than her degree would have prepared her for, but they are exceedingly proud of her nonetheless.

One of the points that the article did not consider is the fact that we are NOT filling our most technical positions in our companies with these women, who are taking up two-thirds of the college slots. No, we are filling them up with foreign men who are imported because our government has, through the help of feminism, affirmative action, and other leftist tinkering, destroyed our own male population's educational opportunities and institutions. Anyone who works in the high tech fields knows this. Take a walk through any engineering department. You will still see American males there, but their numbers are dwindling. There are a few token women in the departments, but the lion's share of the work is being done by imports from India or Asia. That is what feminism has done to our nation's industry.

And why are women filling up the colleges? Is it because they are actually more interested in becoming scientists and engineers? I find the candor of one professor who was quoted in the article, to be quite refreshing:

"I hesitate to say this, but it seems that women have an orientation not only toward achievement, but also toward being good and pleasing others," said Linda Sax, a UCLA education professor, who is writing a book about how women and men develop differently in college. "I think that accounts for some of women's higher achievement rates."

Note the lead-in comment, expressing the fear that all people have who have to deal with the feminist education machine. They speak the truth with hesitation. They hold back the truth if it is really unpleasant, and anything that is only slightly off beam with respect to the feminist dogma gets expressed with qualifications and soft-soap. Even so, here we see that it is the opinion of a female education professor that women are pouring into colleges and doing well because they want to "be good" and to "please others." What in the world are we doing? We are driving our real work force right out of college, and replacing them with women who should be "being good" and "pleasing others" by doing what they are best at, instead

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

of playing school, and then dropping out of the workforce in the critical fields our nation needs filled right now.

The net effect of feminism has been that we have lost our homes, the mothers of our children, and the two parent families that our children need to grow up happy, healthy, and productive members of society, and in trade for this disaster, we have women flooding our colleges, displacing men, and then dropping out of the areas where the men would have filled, forcing companies to hire foreigners to fill the positions. We did not only get one serious negative effect out of the corrupt, and destructive feminist movement, but we have received many. These effects are not "side effects" either. They are the primary effects. The side effects, the ones least important, are the small, and nearly undetectable, positive changes created by feminism.

Here is another item from the article:

Women began making substantial educational improvements after the passage of Title IX, the 1972 law that barred sexual discrimination in educational institutions that spend federal money. But even now that women outpace men in receiving bachelor's and master's degrees, they still receive fewer doctoral and professional degrees and continue to lag in a handful of well-paying fields, including engineering and the sciences.

"Title IX has promoted substantial opportunities for women and has been responsible for a wide range of improvements," said Jocelyn Samuels, vice president of the National Women's Law Center, a Washington, D.C., advocacy group. "The job is not yet done." [Michael A. Fletcher, "Degrees of Separation," *The Washington Post*, 25 June 2002. Pg. A01]

Notice that the unconstitutional Title IX intrusion into our educational system, which is an example of what caused the very problem the hypocritical article is pretending to care about finding a solution for, is skimmed over in a slipshod summation, and referred to as if it were something positive.

Then the point is made that since women have taken over the colleges, they have gobbled up the degrees, and some even went for their masters, but when it came to the top educational degrees, the ones that would drive our science and industries, they fell off. And

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

even in this article, which purported to be worried about the lack of men in the colleges, there is the obligatory quote from the blind feminist, stating that more government intrusion is required to stamp out males wherever they may thrive. These man-haters will not be satisfied until there are no men left anywhere! As this particular one stated in the face of the fact that two-thirds of the new college degrees go to women, "The job is not yet done."

As more and more of our society is forced into decay, and is rotted out from the inside by feminism, and as more and more of our industries' top engineering and scientific jobs go to foreign imports, I think that it is time for Americans to wake up to what has happened to their nation, and its educational system. We have been invaded, and face it, we have been conquered. We can no longer create permanent marriages. We can no longer raise children without the government intruding into the process at every step. We can no longer educate the American men we need to fill the jobs only men can perform well. (See THE BOTTOM LINE.)

In the 1950s, we had the very best schools in the world. Our men were graduating with excellent educations, and they went on to put men on the moon, create computers, and establish several high tech fields of commerce. It was not until the leftists came into our schools and started tinkering that we started seeing our SAT scores fall, and our men start to fall behind the men of other nations in their educational levels of achievement. It is time to stop playing "let's pretend" with the feminists, and to start getting back to what has been proven to work.⁶¹

"A DOZEN AND ONE YEARS LATER" (27 OCTOBER 2010)

When you have a free press, you will find published material that you completely agree with, material that you totally disagree with, and everything in between. Freedom allows you to express views that are not popular, and to do so freely. Americans no longer understand this simple fact.

Long before I created this web page I realized that there was no such thing as a free press in America. I could easily find large amounts of material being put out in the mass media of all types that I completely disagreed with—TV, including evening news, documentaries, entertainment programming, talk shows, etc.; Newspa-

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

pers, including stories covered, opinion pieces, editorials, etc.; books, including both fiction and non-fiction; magazines of all kinds, etc.—but the traditional American view, was being completely suppressed!

In 1997, I found that the Internet was the only place left that was truly free. Traditional American views on many topics, including the topic of feminism, were banned in all the mass media outlets. How could this be? Banning *any* topic completely is a problem, but banning the traditional American view is so outrageous, that it should shock and anger any American.

I realized at the time that, as a simple point of logic, while you could not expect everyone to agree with the traditional view of things, there was no possible way that suddenly all Americans had thrown out their own history, traditions, and way of life willingly. Something else was at work!

This should give us pause. It takes a force of incredible magnitude to block the opinion of the majority from free expression in the most powerful "democratic" country on earth! That formidable enemy is going to have to be faced and beaten, if we are going to make *positive* change. (With the insane use of the word "change" in politics today, one must identify the direction of change that is desired, because you can be sure that when a politician says he is going to provide "change," it is invariably destructive change that he has in mind.)

I had a glimmering idea of the problem in my mind in 1997, but it took years before I fully understood how bad it really is, and how strong the enemy is that enforces PC thought orthodoxy upon us all, which stops you and I from discussing our own views openly on feminism and many other topics.

A dozen and one years ago, I did see that the media was totally in support of the deadly feminist doctrine, and there wasn't a single effective voice speaking out against it. Even Rush Limbaugh, with all his bluster and use of the term "Feminazi," supports all the major tenants of the feminist movement. He verbally opposes abortion, while supporting the real cause of most of those abortions: feminist ideals.

So, I set out to create a place where someone could come and see that, while the media controlled the printing presses and airwaves, they did not control the minds of all Americans; there are those who

are willing to think for themselves. And, if one man could speak out, my hope was that so would others!

Let's look at what it is that I have been speaking out about. Why is your view on feminism important to you, your family, and your country?

The Results of Embracing Feminism Have Been Pouring In

The media monopoly has done its dirty work well, and, as bad as things looked in 1997, things are far worse today.

What is marriage? Marriage is the joining together of a man and woman until death parts them. That is the traditional view of marriage. But today it has been watered down into a game of playing house until the players get tired of the game. The traditional view is seen as being old fashioned and unworkable.

What really is the point of marriage? Even if you accept the traditional view of what marriage is, it still doesn't explain why.

Is it just to make you happy? We have come to put a lot of stock in the idea of happiness. Parents say, "I don't care what my child does when he grows up, as long as he is happy." Taken literally, that view means that their child can grow up and rob banks, and if he enjoys his work, and is happy at it, they are satisfied with that. Clearly this is absurd. Happiness is important, but it is not everything! There has to be more to marriage than that.

There are standards that lie outside of yourself that are more important, yes even more important than happiness. While marriage can, and should, bring a lot of happiness, you get married primarily to create an environment where you can produce and rear children effectively. Now, if you can't have children, of course the other aspects of marriage have to take over for you, but generally, children are the real point of marriage.

It is children who need their real mom and dad to be together as they grow up. They need both kinds of love the entire way as they pass through the stages of childhood, right up into becoming an adult. The protection and softness of a mother cannot be replaced by a father. The strong fatherly adherence to standards and rules of life cannot be replaced by a mother. The father's love is tempered by the mother's, and the mother's by the father's. The blend is something that neither can supply alone.

Common sense tells us that children are the single most important thing that any society produces! Remember, your society will not exist in just a few decades, if you don't produce children to carry that society on, and pass our culture on to them. Therefore, marriage has to be the most important goal for all people in the society, but, thanks to feminism, we have forgotten this. Our children are paying a terrible price for our misguided path, and that cost is being handed down to the entire society as the years go by.

So, What Are We Doing Instead of Marriage?

High schools have been the traditional dating grounds for Americans, where future marriages were shaped. Girls and guys of earlier generations often got married right out of high school. But what is going on today?

It isn't like girls have forgotten about boys in high school. Their clothes are skimpy and scream "sex" and "come take me now!" And, who paid for those clothes the girls are wearing? Who said it was okay to leave the house dressed like that? You know who, and we will return to them a bit later, because they are where the problem begins.

Girls no longer spend their younger days dreaming of becoming wives and mothers. Barbie, symbolizing the single life, is the preferred doll, rather than a baby doll, symbolizing motherhood. Everyone from parents to teachers, and even preachers, are pushing girls to "wait for marriage," while they go to college and start their careers.

However, even though they are not looking for a husband "until later," girls still go on unsupervised dates, simply because it is fun. Dating has become an end in itself, and thanks to the media propaganda, sex and dating are almost interchangeable words today. Girls are programmed to think that sex is the entire point of dating. Sex is fun; it is expected, and everyone does it. So, it is all okay.

Worse, parents almost universally expect their kids to be having sex, not only before marriage, but with no intention of marrying their partners at all.

One of the side effects of this is that around 90% of all kids today are not being raised by both their own mother and father living together. If you realize that kids need that traditional arrangement, like plants need good soil and water, you must see that a disaster is

in the making, the size of which has never been seen before by mankind.

Vampires and Marriage

Marriage is viewed as a guaranteed failure by many young people today, even before entering into it. The media constantly beats that drum, and kids growing up are told over and over again that marriage is risky at best. Of course the ones who are telling them that are the primary reason why it actually is risky today. It is in fact, the priorities that children learn while growing up that set the standards by which they live, and it is these that make marriage easy, difficult, or impossible.

Here is an example of the poison that is being pumped into kids minds these days in movies: the 2010 movie entitled *Twilight Eclipse*. It would be truly ludicrous, if it were not so serious. The lead character is a confused girl who is in love with two guys, one who is a vampire, and the other a werewolf. Hey, this is "real life" okay? She loves the vampire more than the wolfman, but continues to lead the werewolf on, just because she can, and it lets her use him to get things she wants. This itself is a really sick message to send out to the young girls entangled in this series of movies and books. But there is more, and worse.

Aside from the silly mythical side of this story, and the fickle way she is treating the "men" in her life, a point was driven home in one scene where this girl—a girl mind you, who had already made the decision that she wanted to become a vampire, in order to spend eternity with her vampire lover—was struggling with the dilemma of whether or not she should marry the vampire, who set that as a condition of the deal to turn her into a bloodsucker.

Now understand, this girl is all excited to give up her humanity and become a vampire for this guy. She wants to spend forever with him. But she doesn't want to marry him. Why? Because "too many marriages end in failure." You would have to think that this was real life, because surely nothing this stupid could be passed off as fiction; it's that absurd: Become a vampire yes...get married no—because it's "too risky."

This is what is being pumped into the minds of girls and boys being raised today by the feminist media. Is it any wonder that these girls are wandering around without a clue?

Parents Are The Worst Offenders

I already referred to them above when I asked who it was that was dressing the girls for school, but we need to focus more closely upon the parents of today. Sadly, they are greasing the path of failure for their children's marriages, on purpose! They teach their children that feminist ideals are correct: career women are better and happier women. Right from the womb, they expose their kids to a constant stream of feminist propaganda from TV, books, magazines, and computer games. And then send these kids off to the care and feeding provided by a school system that does all that it can to destroy marriage as a goal for the kids. Parents deprecate marriage in the eyes of their children by word and often by their own example.

Think about this for a moment. These are the same mothers who once agonized over what to feed their babies when they were born. They bought books to learn how to not make a mistake in caring for the precious lives that had been placed into their hands. They worried and fretted over the smallest detail of infant rearing, and then, they turned around and put them in front of a TV set, and ruined the brain that is the most important part of that child. They personally pushed the poison propaganda into their babies' minds, and when the kids were old enough, they hired professional mind poisoners for the classrooms, where those teachers will continue the process for them, doing an even better job of it than they could have done for themselves.

These are the same parents who dress their little girls like street walkers because all the other parents are doing it. These are the same parents who send their boys to school dressed like pimps and ghetto rat gangsters because all the other parents are doing it. Parents today have no standards of their own. None. If the other parents are doing it, it is okay. As a child, when I tried to use what other kids did for justification of my own actions, my folks had a reply, which I must pass on to these parents, with a slight change in wording, "If the other parents were jumping off a cliff, would you do it too?"

The Net Results

Now we have suffered under the yoke of the feminist taskmasters for 5 decades, giving time for a couple of generations to grow

up, what have been the results of embracing this venomous way of life?

The result that most clearly jumps out at us is the utter destruction of the institution of marriage. Kids age, without growing up, and live with mommy and daddy until they are 40. Girls start having illegitimate babies, expecting their mommies and daddies to raise both themselves and their offspring. Marriages are happening later and later in life and still they fail far more often than they succeed.

Since the number one point of marriage is to produce the next generation, when marriage fails, so does the next generation. If that doesn't horrify you, you are not paying attention.

When you look at kids today, the outside indicators are all flashing red:

- They are dressing like ghetto rats, whores and criminals (laughingly glorified as "gangstas")—this is only the start, but it is an extremely important item.

Books have been written about how what you wear has a lot to do with how well you succeed in life. "Dressing For Success" was a very popular book in its time, and it pointed out that what you wear is critical to what path you will walk in your efforts to be successful. But what if you intentionally dress for failure?

This is one area where parents have completely given up being parents. They just don't care anymore. Whatever is popular with the other kids, is great for their kids. If their sons dress like gang members, with their pants down around their knees, and hoods, hand signs, and language all showing their allegiance to the most disgusting side of our country, no problem. If their daughters wear skirts with hemlines all the way up to their crotches, that's okay. If they wear their underwear on the outside of their clothes, that is okay. If they expose their breasts to the world, no problem. In fact, there is nothing that is beyond being okay in their minds, as long as the other kids are doing it too. This reasoning is pathological, but it is nearly universal, thanks in a great part to feminism disconnecting parents from their authority, and therefore their responsibilities.

- Something even more distressing is that parents are guilty of criminal negligence when they allow their children to permanently mark their bodies with tattoos, destroying their natural appearance, and also when they turn a blind eye toward their children

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

putting holes into various parts of their bodies to be used to mount decorations, as if they were mindless jungle savages.

While it is unforgivable for parents to dress these children, their own contribution to the next generation, like criminals and moral degenerates, and to allow them to disfigure their bodies, what they have allowed to be done to their children's minds is even worse...

Boys are trained to be lousy husbands and fathers.

When you look at similar peoples around the world, you can see some similarities of course, because nature cannot be denied forever. But you will also find that people who look alike, can also act very differently, because of the way they were brought up. That is the nurture part of the equation.

A very clear indicator of this can be found by comparing different generations of the same people. What is different about kids today? When they look just the same, aside from their attire and body mutilations, it has to be nurture that has changed. The reason that marriages fail today is because the training children have received growing up has changed. The environment that they are living in has been manipulated into a far less friendly one for marriages and children. The reason that men are not making good husbands today is completely dependent upon their upbringing.

- Chivalry is not only thought to be dead, but is considered to be actually evil. According to the official feminist doctrine, a man who opens a door for a woman is a sexist pig. If he expects to get a job and support his family, he is holding his wife down from her fulfillment as a person. In fact if he desires any significant role in the family at all, he is infringing upon the domain of women and is out of line.

Boys and girls are trained from the cradle today that women can take care of themselves, and there is no real need for men in their lives. So, what is it that a boy sees as his role in life? What is left for him to aspire to?

- A boy is taught that women are there to bed, but not to wed! He is trained to view women as casual "lovers," but not worth dedicating himself to for life—he has been taught that "marriage doesn't work." His actions will of course produce children, whom he will not be

there to raise, and to whom he has no real responsibility to, as a father.

- He has been led into the philosophically suicidal path of "He who dies with the most toys wins!" So, he endeavors to grab all the toys he can (cars, phones, entertainment systems, computer games), wallow in drinking, and frittering his life away in other meaningless pursuits.
 - When he tries to "get serious" he only reaches the level of moving from one live-in relationship to another, playing house, without ever growing into manhood, living as an adolescent for life.
- There is little hope for these boys that they will be around to raise their own kids. Being a father has no clear meaning in their minds. Today, many of them are being raised without their own fathers present in the home, so when they have children, they will be at least twice removed from seeing what a real family can be.

Their parents (or single-parent more likely) fail to even attempt to inculcate the long range critical character values in their sons: dedication to family; honor; thoughtfulness; self-sacrifice; work ethic, etc.

Even if they do marry, they expect their wives to have a career, so the family can buy more toys, with no thought about the children's welfare.

- A point that is not even considered by most today is the displacement of boys from colleges and universities. This goes hand-in-glove with the displacement of men from the traditional family role they once filled, as well as the deprecation of the male throughout the entire educational system.

As if shattering the system by which we produce the next generation of Americans, and thereby destroying our future, were not enough, we also have helped to destroy our high-tech industrial workforce. At one time, prestigious all-male universities started accepting a few "coeds" into the student body. The term coed was a term used to show the outside status of females, who were being introduced into these institutions. While the term coed continues to be used today, its meaning has long since departed, because women are getting the majority of diplomas today. (For more on this see *Where Are All the Men?*) While feminists applaud this change, it will spell doom for our society.

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

You should take note here, that all these female degrees have not filled in the quickly opening gaps in our workforce in the areas of science and engineering. Since we don't educate our men, our country is forced to hire men from other countries to work the jobs that our men used to be trained for! Remember, we invented these technologies, but today we have destroyed our scientists and engineers by pursuing the insane goals of feminism!

Girls are trained to be lousy wives and mothers.

What is truly amazing, is that as a society, we have allowed the single most important part of our civilization to be cast as being inferior and even evil. Women, in the traditional roles of wife and mother, have formed the foundation of our civilization, but we allow our girls to be taught that all of that was sexist and demeaning.

It is incredible that any people on earth could be so stupid—especially after all these years of watching the preponderance of indisputable evidence accumulate, and grow into a crushing pile. However, even after all of this proof of the damage that feminism has done to our families, our children, and our society—*most Americans still don't see it*. The very idea that our whole civilization may be on the wrong path, and that our own leaders are sending us to the gallows, is so alien to them that they refuse to see it, even as the noose is being put around their own necks.

Can you imagine a teacher today standing up in the classroom and saying, "A woman should primarily aspire to becoming a good wife and mother"? That teacher would immediately be shown the door: a one-way exit.

And yet, that is how it is with all of the Politically Correct dogmas that have been allowed to infest our school system. Teachers know that, no matter what their personal beliefs are, they will be forced to lie to the children and to promote the PC doctrine. No traditionally minded American can be comfortable with that.

Since the school system is forbidden to teach girls to be wives and mothers, *what is it teaching them?*

We can't cover all the topics here, but I will mention a couple of important ones.

A very important lesson that is taught is that a woman should never depend upon a man for her security.

I hear this line spouted out of mouths too young to even understand what the words mean. It is a plague that has infected all of the

kids in school, and any attempt to inoculate these precious minds against this virus is dealt with harshly.

Movies and TV shows beat this drum constantly, with the PC writers coming up with more and more creative ways for men to let women down in their story lines.

Another destructive lesson that is taught, and one that is closely connected to the first, is that a girl should aim for a career first, before thinking about marriage. What is wrong with a girl going to college and getting her career started before getting married?

In this day and age, girls are exposed to sexual ideas early and often. They are allowed to consume content in their entertainment that is drenched in sex, and almost none of it occurs within marriage, unless it is adulterous. All of the media offerings for role models dress in near nudity and have few if any inhibitions about going to bed with any guy that comes along. In other words, the role models for girls all push them into having sex early and often.

If girls living like unpaid whores is what you want for your daughters, this is not a problem. But it does nothing towards building a solid foundation for the future of your civilization. The point here is that having a girl wait to get married only delays commitment to a life long marriage partner, but it does not delay all of the potential problems of a marriage! And it adds a great many other problems as well.

Considering the upbringing these girls have, by pushing them to wait, what you are really pushing for is their having multiple sexual partners before marriage. What's wrong with that?

- Sexually Transmitted Diseases (STD's or what was once called VD) are running wild in young people today. There are people who actually pretend to be surprised by this fact. Now that is truly surprising!

Some of these diseases are not even curable, and they will change a girl's life forever. Aside from the physical problems these will cause, perhaps even ending her young life, having a sexually transmitted disease like herpes, will harm any future marriage relationship, and possibly be passed on to future children. What a terrible thing for a parent to do to his daughter! And it is done on purpose, with the sole justification being that "everyone else is doing it."

- Pregnancy is all too common in young unmarried girls. They are taught all about how to have sex in school, increasing the odds even more that they will experiment with it, but it is all too common to not even use condoms while doing it, no matter how many times schools mention them or even give them away. Illegitimacy is on the rise. Again, just like finding the ground wet after a heavy rain, this should be no surprise to anyone. Actions always have consequences.

Raising an illegitimate child is very difficult. Now remember, why was it that she waited to get married? To go to school? With an illegitimate child? At this point, only an imbecile would think this was a good idea.

And something that feminists never give a single thought to, what about the child? Being illegitimate is always an inferior situation for the child, compared with being raised by both of his parents together. But who cares? Our society turns a deaf ear to the cries of the children who have been deprived of a father by our stupidity.

- Having multiple sexual partners before marriage, especially ones that produce one or more children by other men, will weaken any future marriage. And the poor child, or children, who are brought into the arrangement will be second class family members to the husband who will probably want kids "of his own." Get that? *His own*. Kids from other fathers will not be "his own." It is a sad fact of life that preexisting children will feel like outsiders when the privileged "real" children come along later.

Even the dimmest bulb of an intellect can't miss the moral of all the tales of old—from Dicken's masterpiece, *David Copperfield*, to the many children populating the stories of the Brothers Grimm—telling of the trials of poor children who had to endure the mistreatment of horrible stepparents.

The stories could have been told as if it were merely bad parents abusing the children, rather than stepparents, but that would not have been as compelling to those who understand the parent and child relationship. While bad parents exist, stepparents always start off on the wrong foot, and then easily fall into problems that *real parents*⁽¹⁾ don't normally have to deal with. Natural, biologically produced parent/child love has to be replaced with an artificial creation. It takes far more work for a stepparent to be a good parent, and then, even if he is a wonderful person, and does all he can, he still has to contend with children who might reject

him out of hand, as a gesture of loyalty to their own biological parent.

This is basic common sense for anyone who spends even a few moments thinking about it, or who simply looks around at all the shattered remnants of families struggling on around him in our society.

What happens as you age? You develop lines of thought, habits, and ways of doing things. The longer you travel down this road, the more deeply are the tracks cut into the path you are walking. You become less flexible and less able to change. Not surprisingly, when you get married later in life, it is far more difficult to adjust to a spouse who has his own set of habits, and ways to do things. Instead of two young people learning about life together, adjusting and creating a joint path to walk, they are in contention about many little and often truly insignificant things. The later they marry, the worse this problem is.

The fact is, by waiting to marry a girl will, just as will a boy, be significantly less flexible, which will increase the level of general irritation for both parties, and multiply the odds of having a failed marriage.

In The End Feminism Destroys Your Society!

It is easy to see how feminism destroys the future of any society that embraces it, with just a bit of thought. Think of what your contribution will be to this society after you are dead. You will be lying in the ground with no voice, no possible method of contributing anything at all to making things good in this society. Clearly, if you live only for your own life, and you only focus on fulfilling your own goals and dreams, even if you are wonderfully successful in what you do, once you die, your contribution is over, completely over. Now what?

If you did not produce children, or at least instruct children in becoming like you, whatever you had to offer dies with you. Your life was a zero, a complete nothing, as far as the society and its future is concerned. You came, you lived, you died, and you were forgotten.

It is the children of our society that matter the very most! It is they who will become the entire society in just a short while. And yet, it is the children who are under the severest attack by feminism!

Kids and feminism are mutual enemies.

What would you say about a group who has conspired to kill tens of millions of people? Even more telling, is the fact that this group has aimed at the most innocent and helpless humans that have ever existed on planet earth? This group has been the cause of the death of more humans than any other group that has ever existed.

Do you want to know why the media talking heads, and the newspaper headlines are discussing the need for immigrant workers in your country? It is because feminism has killed the ones who would have been born, and who would have filled those jobs with Americans. This process alone, at the rate it is currently going, will completely remove our society and replace it with something entirely different. In fact it is already well on the way towards happening in many parts of the country.

If killing tens of millions of innocent people doesn't horrify you, it is a clear sign of how feminism has had its way with your own ethical system. To put that number into perspective, remember that we lost less than 417 thousand men from the US during World War II. *Every year in the United States we kill twice as many unborn babies as the total number of men we lost in the Second World War.* We make movies about World War II over and over and over again, but we live our lives each day without a thought about the far greater tragedy that is going on right now on our own soil: and every one of those deaths is of a helpless, unarmed, utterly defenseless, and completely innocent child. *It is distilled murder, in its purest form, if you define murder as the taking of an innocent life.*

Clearly, feminists hate children, but why?

It is obvious that *children are in the way* of all of the proclaimed feminist goals. How can a woman do a good job as a mother if she is working? Or, looking at it from the feminist point of view, how can a woman do a good job in her career, if she is tied down with a child (or worse, children) to raise? Children will always impact a woman's career, because children have needs that only a mother can fill. Daycare centers and schools cannot replace mothers, and most women know this. Indeed, children, and their *needs*, highlight the differences between men and women so clearly that even a feminist cannot ignore it.

So, the only choice, if you wish to promote feminist ideals, is taking the children out of the picture anyway you can: *even killing them in the womb*. Failing that, you will arrange to send them off to the day care center, and since you are in power with the government, have the taxpayers pay for the internment of the next generation during its formative years.

Since the children will be the society in just a few short years, by killing them, or destroying their mom-based education, it is easy to see that feminists are dismantling our society's future.

By destroying our families, feminism has removed the positive influences that a strong family brings to the shaping of children's characters—the same characters that they will take in to work with them one day.

Finally, if we do not produce children in sufficient numbers (2.1 per family minimum to sustain current population levels) and then hand over our cultural values to them, our society will die, and some other society will replace it. There is a growing amount of territory in the USA today where those who were here before are no longer welcome to safely walk the streets. The growth rate of this territory is staggering, but without our children, there is nothing for the future but displacement and dispossession from our lands and way of life. In other words, as a people, we will be wiped out.

Today is under attack as well!

We don't have to wait for future generations to suffer all of the ills from the feminist attack. It is already a plague upon us, even if the murder of millions of babies doesn't bother you at all.

Look at the young adults of today. They are completely confused about life and marriage. Most of them are terrified of marriage itself, not just marrying one particular person. The average young adult is waiting much longer before getting married today, and then, with the training they have received, and the insane expectations that training has created for them, as well as the many bad habits they have picked up during the time they spent single, when they actually do get married, they are getting divorced almost as soon as they finish with the honeymoon. You can thank feminism for nearly all of this.

Sadly, their personal relationships are no deeper than a text message and they are not spending any time at all in focusing on what it

takes to be a great spouse or parent. They are only worried about what makes themselves happy (remember what their parents taught them: "We only want you to be happy.") and don't look very much beyond that egocentric view of reality. This is how an animal often behaves, or a new born infant, but adults should have a wider view of things. But not the ones we have raised recently, and the ones who will be arriving next will be even worse off.

Perhaps the most frightening part of this is that even the parents of the young adults today have no clue how to help them, having been themselves saturated in the feminist propaganda for their entire lives. Each minute that goes by moves our people farther away from the good examples of what a marriage should be, and how to raise children who will carry on your values and who will perpetuate your way of life into the distant future. Face it, the parents of these poor confused young people, are the very ones who pushed their kids into this dilemma in the first place, by following the feminist lead.

Feminism Is Poison - So Now What?

Okay, you get it. You see the problem, but it looks insurmountable! The feminists hold complete power in our government:

- Feminists control the Supreme Court, so all rulings from that bench will support feminist ideals. This has been true for decades now.
- Feminists control the entire media complex.
 - No novel can be published today without what the publishers call "a strong female lead."
 - Ever compare a movie of today with one made in the 1940's? The roles of men and women have been radically altered by the feminist domination of our entertainment world.
 - The broadcast news picks up stories that support feminist ideals while suppressing ones that run contrary to their aims.
- The entire government complex lives in fear of the feminists.
 - The military is forced to put women into roles that no one in the chain of command honestly wants to use them in, but anyone, from the President of the United States, down to the low-

est non-commissioned officer dares to speak up, because he knows that his job is in the balance. You will support feminism or you will be removed from your position.

- The police force is in exactly the same position as the military, as is the fire department.
- Picture if you will, anyone in the government making a statement that supported the idea that men should be the head of households, and the bread winners, while women should be at home raising the kids. Now what would happen to that official within minutes of his having made such a public statement? You have witnessed what happens when the media sharks go into a feeding frenzy often enough, and it continues on for quite some time, even after the official has resigned from office. You know what happens, and so does every single government official. They will toe the line, or they will be gone!
- Facts are not allowed to be presented to the public by the holder of any office in the government let alone have those facts be used to determine the course of action that the government will take on any matter that would run counter to feminist ideals. Facts by the score are suppressed in order to perpetuate the myth that feminism is a sane and useful set of beliefs.
- The public school system and even the private schools themselves are under the thumb of the feminist movement.
 - No teacher would keep his job if he promoted the ideals of the traditional family to his class!
 - All textbooks are loaded with feminist ideas in the way they phrase things, the pictures they use, and the examples they use in their discussions. If you go to a used books store and pick up a textbook, on any topic you wish, that was used before 1965, and then compare that with any textbook you wish on that topic being used today, you will see that feminism—as well as all the other PC doctrines—are saturating the books of today, while being absent from the older books.

It looks bad. We are on the ropes, and our society appears to be doomed in just a few short decades. Is it hopeless? Or is there something we can do?

Stop, Look, and Listen

In years gone by, they routinely posted a sign by railroad crossings that said, "Stop, Look, and Listen." That is good advice in life

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

generally. How much of what we do is ruined because we fail to stop, look around, and listen to what people are saying. If you are paying close attention, it is hard for a con man to pull one over on you. No politician could sway you with smooth sounding words that say nothing, if you pay attention. When things go wrong because of a change that government does, you won't ignore it and avoid thinking about it.

It is a fact that no train crossing was ever more deadly than the situation American children face today. If a baby makes it past the feminist abortion assassination plot, he is still doomed if we don't act to save him!

STOP—Take a break from the media propaganda for a moment. Turn off your TV, set that newspaper or magazine down, and clear your mind.

If you cease to bring garbage into your mind, you can set to cleaning out what is already there.

LOOK—Pay attention to what is going on around you. How can this insane approach to families and raising kids have a happy ending? It can't! Surely there has to be a better way!

LISTEN—Start listening to your own reason, rather than letting the media talking heads, and the TV propaganda entertainment mega machine do all your thinking for you. If you are told something is good or bad, assume you are being lied to, until you have proof in your own hands to validate what you were told. The ones who brought this feminist curse upon us are the very ones who pay the salaries of those talking heads, even the so-called "Conservative commentators."

Only after you have finally stopped the media dump truck from depositing garbage onto the lawn of your mind will you have it in your power to clean up the mess.

You Already Have the Answer!

The best part of this otherwise bleak situation is that *you don't have to reinvent the wheel*, in order to find a solution. For thousands of years our ancestors have effectively raised their young in the family environment.

For centuries, Americans have created families with each generation, which usually lasted for life. These families depended upon a partnership between a man and a woman with well defined and dif-

ferentiated individual roles. We know they work, because those families produced our Founding Fathers, mothers for all, scientists, our industrial wizards, war heroes, and our farmers. The entire wealth of this nation flowed from the efforts of people who never dreamed that feminism would exist as it does today, and who would have shunned it aggressively had they known it could exist.

When you discover that you are going the wrong direction in your car, what do you do? First you stop moving in the wrong direction. You then turn your car around and start moving in the right direction. Finally, you then end up where you wanted to go in the first place.

We know that the families of the past worked and what we are doing today will end in the death of our society. So, what must we do? We must:

- Stop giving any voice to feminism, and pretending that these people have anyone's best interests at heart other than their own, as they grasp for more and more political power.
- Counter the propaganda stream that is pouring into the eyes and ears of our children, and aggressively teach our children what is right, and what the lies are that they must defend themselves against during their days of repeated exposure to the media/school propaganda blitzkrieg.
- Live by example, and never pass up an opportunity to positively instruct children and even young adults on what we know works, and what we know doesn't work.

Do not be discouraged!

It was only a handful of people who caused this mess, less than 2% of our population. They were able to derail our train by their efforts. Admittedly, they had the destructive men who own the media behind them, and that made it possible to pull off. But still, they were small in number.

Fortunately, we have a lot more than an anemic 2% of the population who hate what has happened to our country! At some point, even people sleeping as soundly as Americans are sleeping today, will have to wake up.

In the meantime, just do your part, and don't worry about the rest. Your part is important, and in the end, it will be people just like you who will fix this nightmare!

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

[While some might balk at the term "real parents," there isn't a single one of them who doesn't understand the term. It is a concept that is rooted in biology so deeply that it cannot be removed from it. Children who were adopted go looking for their real parents in time if they can. That biological connection is there, no matter how much you might pretend that it is not.]⁶²

"MILITARY MADNESS AND FEMINISM" (30 JUNE 2016)

If you have a brain, and it is switched on, you have to be outraged. If you love America, the America that was here when I was born, you have to be pulling your hair out with frustration and fury. As our country is being destroyed, we are not allowed to talk about it, at least in public, because there are laws, company policies, and many other hatchets ready to be buried into your head if you open your mouth in protest.

There are hundreds of outrages and complete absurdities that have been forced down our throats. Since this page is focused on feminism, I will hold it there, although that is only one of the many heads the Media Lords have working for the beast they have created to destroy America.

I am not going to dumb this down into a 250 words or less, short attention span format. If that is all you can handle you are not going to be much good to anyone anyway.

However I am going to focus on one topic, and some of its side issues: women in the military. It isn't a new issue, but like a dike that has started to allow water to flow through, the damage is getting far worse and it has started to move quickly.

Look high and low throughout all the circus of discussions on this topic and the one thing you don't ever find is anyone seriously suggesting that women in the military would make the military stronger and more effective. Only a liar or a fool would suggest such a thing.

Sports have traditionally been known to replace war for men. It is competition that pits the best of one team against the best of the other team to see who will WIN. It is a battle, fought under strict rules and with control so the guys don't kill each other, usually. Even so, men die in the boxing ring, and have been killed playing baseball as well. They have been crippled for life, in football. Even with all the precautions the guys can get hurt and hurt in very bad ways.

And yet we continue to play sports and watch sports for entertainment. Although we don't slaughter the contestants, like the Romans did in their coliseum, the motivation is the same, to see one guy or one team crush another. This is a basic male drive that is genetic.

We take our sports so seriously that we base decisions on who is on the team roster and who plays on the field, on only one criteria: will it help the team win. Nothing else matters.

Notice, that using this criterion for selecting participants, women have not been found to be good enough to play, professionally in the NHL, the NFL, MLB or the NBA.

So, I put it to you, how could it happen in the military, which is infinitely more important than sports, we have people forcing the women into roles that can be as demanding as any sport, or more so, while we let the far less significant area of sports use merit alone to decide? Clearly the number of women who can keep up with the men is microscopic, if not zero. So, why do we have to upend everything for this tiny, minuscule, unimportant minority of people just to keep the feminists happy? Why? How will this make our military better?

Clearly it will not:

1. Male units have been shown in other countries' services (including the Israeli army) to perform far better when females are removed from combat teams.
 - a) Males end up vying for female attention, this is distracting at best, and can totally disrupt the unit at worst.
 - b) Males protect females, sometimes risking the mission to do so.
2. Hygiene and privacy issues are nearly impossible to deal with in the field.
3. Ships have to be redesigned—at unbelievably high cost, to an already overpriced ship—in order to make female heads, berthing arrangements and security and safety arrangements.
4. Rape continues to be a huge problem in the military, and putting women into these units will only increase this problem.
5. There is a steady stream of complaints and allegations of:
 - c) Sexual harassment.
 - d) Sexual discrimination.

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

- e) And unfairness of all sorts based upon sex. -obviously, none of these things would exist at all if women were not in the military in the first place.
- 6. As already mentioned, in order for women to be there at all, the overall standards had to be lowered, making the entire military weaker.
- 7. Any nation that had a single real man left in it would never consider allowing women to go and fight for the men, while the men remained home.

I defy anyone with any sense at all who had to face an enemy army, to honestly claim that they would not massively prefer fighting against an all female force to fighting against an all male force. Only a liar or a fool would say otherwise.

There is no issue here. Women can't do the job and shouldn't be there.

On April 19, 2015 Army General Martin E. Dempsey, the nation's top military officer, laid down an edict on the Obama administration's plan to open direct land combat jobs to women: *If women cannot meet a standard, senior commanders better have a good reason why it should not be lowered.*

In 2015, with the men's standards in place, no women could pass. Suddenly in 2016, almost all that entered are passing. Is it a coincidence that General Dempsey stated that if women can't pass the standards, the standards should be lowered? Obviously that is exactly what happened.

Who on earth would think that the way to a better military is to lower standards? No one honestly thinks that. The fact is, this is treason hard at work. These people don't give a damn about defending our country, they only care about making life easier for feminists. When they talk, their take on this issue is that the military isn't our country's defense, it is a "career opportunity."

Obviously, those of us who think defense is important, have the wrong idea. We think the military should be strong and it should be the best it can be, so our country can be defended at the best possible level.

Clearly, none of that matters. What matters is that all women should be allowed to serve in the military because it is "fair" and it is "inclusive," and all that happy horse manure.

The latest standards claim that infantry training is marked by "the toughest thing in the course" being a 12-mile march carrying 80 pounds. That is the toughest part of the training? Are they kidding? What happened to the rope climb that ALL the women failed in 2015? Did they decide that war would never require you to do any climbing today?

Standards, who needs them?

Today, as has been the case all along, every one of the services has lower physical standards for women than they do for men. The only way they can get rid of that, is to lower the standards for all the men, as well as for the women. And what effect will that have? Come on, you know it as well as I do: you are not only going to get inferior females in the ranks, but you are also going to get inferior males in the ranks, than you were getting before!

Who is running this circus? Bozo the clown? Obviously.

There is one issue and only one issue: the marxist feminists are disrupting every part of our society they can lay their hands on. That is the issue, the only issue, and we need to deal with it with extreme prejudice.

Oh by the way, have you ever watched two female boxers go at it? They are a joke. Just like female tennis players, they run at a hugely slower and weaker pace than men. Do they think for one moment that the enemy will take it easy on our army because we were too stupid to leave the women at home where they belong? They will overrun any female force like it wasn't even there.

Sure if you are sitting in a room pushing a button to fire a cruise missile a precocious 10-year old could do that job. But what happens when the room is overrun by enemy forces and you have to fight hand to hand to save your life?

This entire issue is ludicrous, pure and simple. *It has no support in reality.*

I remember when "your mother wears combat boots" was an insult, because no one would even think about a woman in that role. And they sure as shooting (pun intended) shouldn't be thinking about it now.

The discussion is always centered around whether or not women can do the job,—and they always fudge the numbers in the tests they perform, in order to make it look like they can do what they

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

can't do: the job—and it never is centered on setting the standards high and making everyone meet them or they are not accepted.

It is also impossible to discuss whether women should even be there at all, morally and ethically.

Throughout our history as a people, running all the way back into our European roots, it has been the role of men to protect the women and children, because they are the future of your society.

Testing has been done over and over again by the military and it has been consistent in the results that it produces. The only way women can pass the tests is to lower the standards. Period.

Lower standards mean you get lower quality soldiers and sailors. End of story. So, why do it? You don't do it for the NFL do you? Why not?

Women totally outperform men in producing babies, which we are in dire need of. (Our current White birth rate is around 1.6. Just to reproduce our numbers and keep our population stable, we need 2.1 White babies from women on average. Our absolute, not just relative, numbers are shrinking, while the US total population numbers are exploding in growth. Do the math here.) But do we discuss this fact? We need women to have babies. We desperately need women to have babies. And yet, instead, we keep trying to put a square peg into a round hole, and people take it seriously. Why? Because the media tells them they must.

Seriously, how is it that all of life shows you one thing, and the media asks you, "Who are you going to believe, us or your own lying eyes?" and you are supposed to ignore what you know, and believe their lies as if it were gospel truth?

And remember, the same exact jerks who are pushing women into the military are, AT THE VERY SAME TIME, pushing laws that put women into effectively the same role as children, needing to be protected from men in a special way! They are pushing through domestic violence laws and other laws to protect women, because they need protection.

It is obvious that if they need special protection they of course do not need to be put in harm's way intentionally, by having them in the military nor the police force. *Only an insane person could push both of these ideas at the same time as being valid*, or, as it turns out to be the real situation, a person who is a lying scoundrel who has a hidden agenda.

We all know that women, on average, are incapable of defending themselves against men. This is why we teach boys, or at least we used to, not to ever hit girls. How can we teach boys to never hit girls, and then put girls in the police force, and the military? This is a true expression of insanity, if we try and succeed in accepting these contrary views of women. It is either one or the other. You can't have both. Period.

And of course, as soon as you are stupid enough to say it's okay to put women into combat, then you have no grounds for saying that women shouldn't be drafted, even if they don't want to be. What kind of country have we become? This is monstrous. I saw this coming back in the 1970s. I knew the jerks would get around to this in time. But no one cares, at least not in large enough numbers to matter.

We have turned the asylum over to the patients and this is what we get.

What if food service lowered its standards and you didn't have to keep your kitchen quite so clean, or doctors didn't have to change their gloves between every patient, etc.? This is insane and any clear-thinking person knows it.

The problem is that we have powers pulling the strings, and making sure the clear thinking is no longer allowed. It is intolerance to be clear-thinking. You are not a good party member if you don't go along with the party line.

And this is America, we're talking about, and not the Soviet Union? Yeah, right.

Another point, one of the primary things that infuriates me to the relief valve stage is how they talk about the military like it is a career opportunity that women are entitled to. (Anyone who isn't sick of the words "entitled" and "entitlements" by now, is not paying attention at all. You have no rights today, but boy do you have entitlements.)

The military is not a right. It is not something even the most fit and awesomely coordinated and brilliant man who ever lived is entitled to. No one is entitled to serve in the military. You serve in the military because your country needs you. "It is not what the military can do for you, but what you can do for the military," to steal and slightly modify a quote from a man who two US air craft carriers have been named for.

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

This is not a right. Period. It is not a chance to further your professional life. It is something that you can do for your country, if they need you. It isn't something you should even think about forcing your way into.

I keep coming back to this but where is all this hoopla about the NFL? You can be sure if women can do the job, the NFL will hire them. They would hire a trained monkey if it would help them win. No one is holding women back in sports, but biology is. (There are a few women who can't stand even that. They are furious at the universe that they were not born men, and can never be men.)

Biology is sexist and there is no getting around that fact. There are men and there are women. And they are very different. It isn't merely stupid, and it isn't merely insane, trying to make the society pretend that women and men are the same, and should have the same roles in life; it is fatal. And of course that is the aim of those pushing this agenda, isn't it? They want us out of their way, and so they return to pushing these sorts of obscenities over and over again. They never quit.

We keep backing down, and they keep demanding more. No one seems to see this. We keep backing down, and they keep demanding more. Over and over again, this has happened, and we still don't react. They keep doing it, and doing it, and doing it. And we keep shaking our heads, after we have lost, and we accept the fact that they won on one issue after another, as if this were a game, and we are simply being good sports about losing.

This isn't a game. This is the future of our entire existence, as a people, and as a country. Being a good sport is not an option here. We are fighting for our very lives, and we insanely lose gracefully, over, and over, and over again.

We need a new game plan. We need a new approach to life. This stuff is killing us, literally.

Up until now the entire discussion has been about whether women could do the job at all. No one has suggested that women could do it better than men. And as long as we have men, what could possibly be the point of all this?

We know. It isn't about defense or the military at all. It is about biology and the fact that it handed the feminists a raw deal because they were not born men and they will be miserable forever and won't rest until everyone else is just as miserable.

At least that is the way it looks from the outside.

However, in point of fact they are all happy as can be, because they are succeeding in bringing down the greatest nation that ever existed. They have won and in their hearts they are as happy as FDR was when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor. They have what they wanted.

Anyone who is in the military knows it is verboten to speak against the feminist agenda. The higher you are up the chain of command, the more pressure you have on you to promote the insane feminist agenda. But secretly, they all know that is a destructive path we are on.

Everyone I have talked to, who was in the military recently, is terrified of saying anything to knock women in the military. Your career is done if you ever get that into your record, that you oppose feminism. I heard a chief petty officer in 1977 state that women were not fit for combat duty and many other types of duty. He said it at a meeting and it was with a large group of sailors. In all my years in service, it was the last time I ever personally heard anyone who was in a position of authority state anything publicly against women in the military.

Today, whenever you discuss this with a person of rank in the military they will always preface their comments with the fact that they have seen a handful of women who could do this job or that. They were all abnormal women, of course, complete freaks of nature. AND even they could not keep up with the men! They could just do a particular job, or a task.

Girls in the military are coddled all the way. They don't do the same job, and in point of fact, they couldn't possibly do the job.

Something that doesn't even matter, but it is related. I have seen women who were dominant female athletes at commands where I was stationed. However, when they came over and played with the men's teams, as good as they were for women, they just couldn't do the job on the field. They couldn't move as fast. Even if they could catch a well hit ball in the infield, they couldn't throw as hard. You could hide them in your line up somewhere, but they were not going to help the team. The best women were still a weak spot on your team. That was slow pitch softball. They didn't even bother trying to play football, even flag football.

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

Why do this, unless you are trying to do something destructive? Clearly, without any sort of debate possible (of rational people—I have to add that caveat, because in the media you can't find any of these anywhere), it can be stated as a fact, women in the military will only make it worse. Period. End of story.

In 1998, the Williams sisters Serena and Venus said they could beat any male outside of the top 200. (First of all, that means they felt they were so bad compared with men, that they had to go below 200 of the top players to feel they could win.) As it turned out number 203, Karsten Braasch beat them both on the same day, after playing a round of golf in the morning, having a couple of beers and smoking a few cigarettes. As it turned out, he smoked the girls as well, 6-1 and 6-2.

After the match Serena Williams was quoted as saying, "I didn't know it would be that hard. I hit shots that would have been winners on the women's tour and he got to them easily."

This facade of women and men, being physical equals, has been shown to be as absurd, as the man behind the curtain really being the great Wizard of Oz. Even with handicaps, like the man only gets a first serve, and there are no second serves for him, while the woman gets to have a second serve, if the first one doesn't go in, and he has to hit the ball only into the single court of his opponent, for his offensive shots, but the woman gets to use the single court plus the doubles alleys for her shots, it is an easy win for the man: no contest. But, being raised in this phony feminist world, Serena actually thought she was way better than she really was, until she had to actually face real men on the court.

And that was only tennis. But when it happens to women who are in the military, when we one day have to face an army of men from a country that is our match militarily it would be far worse than just losing a game! (We can hide them today because we have all these fancy smart weapons that keep women from having to face up to real life.) And that day is coming, as our strength crumbles year after year.

So, why should we do it?

Think of how people would react if they said, "Okay, Major League Baseball, equal opportunity and affirmative action rulings demand that you have to lower your standards. From now on you

have to meet a quota so that half of your players are women and you have to have them on the field, not sitting on the bench."*

People would go nuts! They wouldn't stand for it. Why in the world would we do it for the military (and our police force, for that matter), when our country's existence may depend upon what the military can, and cannot do? People ignore the critical, and get all worked up over something as unimportant as their entertainment. They won't let you mess with their sports, but you can destroy their country, and that's okay with them?

But year after year it **ONLY GETS WORSE**, just like everything else. You give the Media Lords an inch and they take it quickly, and keep it forever. And instantly, they then demand another one, and another one and another one. Miles and miles you give up and still they demand more. You can't satisfy them, because they are not looking for satisfaction. They are looking for disruption and chaos. No matter what you give up they want all of what is left to you. All of it!

Seriously, this issue is not really about women in the military. Feminism isn't really about women at all. It is about undermining the power of the ones who created this country, the White males, and disrupting everything in our society to the point where chaos reigns and people will be willing to let the government do whatever it wants, just like Big Brother did in 1984.

Did you read *1984*? Did you pay attention to what O'Brien told Winston Smith about what was really going on? It is about power, for power's sake and it is about nothing else.

All of the causes they have been creating and leading: feminism; civil rights; the 1960s anti-war movement; and today, climate change and environmentalism; as well as health care "reform"; and when it comes down to it, the communist party itself; all are shams. These creeps don't care about women, Africans, war/peace, the climate or the planet, and they sure don't care about your health care. All they care about is power, their power, for power's sake. All these causes and movements are nothing but tools to funnel all the power in the country into their greedy little hands.

* (See "The Old Ball Game.")

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

And guess what? It has worked. You are already doomed. No election is going to save you. Put that in your pipe and smoke it, and I hope you like the taste of it.

Oh, one final point. When the collapse happens and chaos comes to rule, women are the ones who will suffer the most. Civilization, our civilization, has treated women better than any civilization that has ever existed. When we return to barbarism, women are going to be on the bottom of the heap. If you care about women, you have to hate feminism.⁶³

"WOMEN IN CHESS" (25 NOVEMBER 2016)

It is November 25, 2016, the day after Thanksgiving, and the World Chess Championship has a day off today, but there are two games left to play, and Magnus Carlsen and Sergey Karjakin are tied with 5 points each. This event reminded me that as with the *The Real Special Olympics* for physical sports, we also have something similar for the World Chess Championship.

As is usual with these sorts of things they don't have an exclusive rule that sets aside the real title as a "Mens Chess Champion." Men and women both can compete equally for the crown. And what happens when you remove affirmative action, and special treatment for women, to allow them to play their fantasy game of *Men and Women Are Just the Same*?

It should come as no surprise that true equal opportunity leads to the same thing as segregation does, and that is that only men end up at the top playing for the title. In fact while occasionally one or two women will creep into the top one hundred rated players, today the *Live Chess Ratings list* has zero women on it. The top woman player in the world today has a rating of 2650.5 (and she is 80 points over number two), and the bottom of the top 100 overall list is 2653.2. The bottom of the top ten of the best in the world is 2770.7, or 120 points over the top woman player. And at the very top of the list is current world champion with a 2842.0, nearly 200 points over the top female player.

Since women have been getting a "hand up" for the past 60 years or so, from the schools and the government, so that they now get more college degrees than men, no one can legitimately claim that women are being held back, and that includes in chess. All the polit-

ical forces today are pushing women as hard as they can to do things that women are ill-equipped to do, and chess is no exception. Why are women doing so poorly, when they are given complete equal opportunity?

I am not saying that women can't play chess. The top female players are really good. They would stomp all over the average male player in the chess clubs. The point is that the top female chess players are not even close to the top male players.

It is hard to tell if it is funny, or just plain sad, the way the feminists all make a huge fuss over one woman: Judit Polgár. She was really a good player. She played in men's tournaments and worked her rating up near the top for a time. Her peak rating was 2735. That is not even close to the World Champion today, but she was a serious player in her prime. However, she never had any hope of being champion. And her biggest claim to fame was beating Gary Kasparov, once. She was the only woman to do so, and that gets the feminists all worked up. What they don't tell you is that she lost eleven times to him and could only draw 3 times. As a general rule, grandmasters will draw. Even when one is slightly better they draw more often than not. But to have only one win and eleven losses with only three draws is a very bad showing usually. And remember Magnus Carlsen nearly beat Kasparov at the tender age of thirteen. In any sport if you or your team play fifteen games and you lose eleven of them, you don't have anything to brag about. And if you play that many games and only win one, well that is terrible.

This is not to belittle this lone win, but it is to belittle the morons who pump it up into more than it is. Instead of using their heads for reason, rather than letting emotions run away with them, we have claims that this makes her as good as the best men chess players. The real point, which nearly everyone either misses or intentionally ignores, is that even if Judit Polgár were a freak genius and were to stomp all over the men players—and if you listen to her supporters talking about the woman that all agree is the greatest woman player of all time, you would incorrectly think that is what she did—no other women were doing anything like that. If this were just the difference in the number of male players and female players, you would expect to find that the top one hundred chess players list would have 20% women, or at least 10% women on it, ranging up and down through the entire list. Today there are none, and when

Judit Polgár was in her prime, she was the only one. There is clearly more to it than that.

If you want a good laugh, all you have to do is do a Google search on this topic and you will find a dozen different "experts" pushing the idea that this is not biological. Let's pretend that women and men have the same inherent ability to play chess, and we start from there for all our analysis. Let's exclude the only answer that works, the biological fact that men and women have different capabilities both mentally and physically (Vive la différence!), and pretend there is some other reason that even women who are bright and devote their lives to chess, even women who are completely supported by their government to be full time chess players, still come up short.

One of the funniest claims is that women are "outnumbered." There are more women in the United States than there are men. Around the world there are plenty of women, and they are not outnumbered by men. If they choose not to play, then they are not outnumbered, they are simply not motivated, for whatever reason, to play chess. I am sure that the simple fact they lose more often when they play couldn't have anything to do with that.

We find experts claiming that women are simply not driven to compete the way men are. That is true of course, but then the same experts will put on a dog and pony show to demand that you believe women are just as competitive as men. As is usual with feminists, they don't care about consistency nor the truth, just as long as they get their way.

I think the funniest part of this is how they squabble over allowing women to have their own little lesser chess world in which to play, so that they can win prize money, for playing at a level where they would have no hope of ever winning anything with the men. There is one camp that feels the money they win at their own tournaments draws in more women to play and so it improves the level of women's chess.

Then you have the whiners who berate the women for taking those crumbs, and the chess world for offering them in the first place, because it is holding women back from competing for the only prize that matters to the feminist: the men's title.

We somehow have found a way to live with the idea that women can dress up in sexy little outfits and play tennis with each other,

and people will pay to come watch them play. They can't, and don't have to beat the top male players. No one expects them to. We don't waste ink or megabytes of data justifying the concept that women and men play tennis equally well, and if only we wait a few more years the women will catch up with the men in tennis. We know better, and just don't talk much about it.

But chess is different. Chess is mental, and the feminist is bound and determined to fight the idea that the brain of a man and the brain of a woman are quite different. Anyone over the age of ten knows that men and women think differently. Just having a conversation, you find that sex gets in the way often. The male brain and the female brain approach nearly everything differently. People expect this in their daily interactions. They simply accept it, just like having women's tennis.

If the intent of feminism were legitimate, and they were really trying to make things better for women, they would search what is real in the universe, and try and make the best of that for women. Instead, they create a false image of the universe and demand that we all pretend their fictional view is the only view. They have forced the government into backing this false image of men and women, and then we wonder why it is that nearly everything related to women is failing horribly.

Why is divorce so common? Why do women have babies without even being married? Why must they work and raise children at the same time? Why are unwanted pregnancies and sexually transmitted diseases out of control? Why are young ladies taught to dress like they are ready to become prostitutes, a walking invitation to dalliance, sent off to school dressed like that, and at the same time told from every direction that they are to be terrified of marriage, because it is too risky?

Hasn't that insanity ever made you wonder? We are doing everything we can to induce our children into having sex, with the music they listen to, the TV shows and movies they watch, and the way they dress, and the way parents don't supervise them on dates, etc., while at the same time, trying to stop them from getting married too young, because "it might fail."

It not only might fail, using this formula, it almost certainly will. How many men will a girl go through before she finally gets married? How many girls will the groom go through before he gets mar-

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

ried? They probably will have one or more STDs by that time, and maybe the girl has had a child or two by one or more of her lovers, or an abortion on her conscience, and the stresses on the marriage are high right away. Those are piled on top of the normal problems any marriage will face, and the entire thing is almost certain to collapse.

Feminism has one purpose, and one purpose only: to bring power into the hands of the ones who are driving this charade. They knew that the United States of the 1950s was far too powerful to take down directly. No nation on earth was its equal. The USA produced more goods than any other nation. The USA had schools that were as good as any nation on earth and our population was at the very top for education. Divorce was low, and marriages were sound. Men earned the paycheck and women were homemakers and mothers. The population grew up with this goal in mind. Schools taught this ideal to the kids.

As long as that continued, the USA would never fall. So, the ones who drove all the various movements in the 1960s to pull this country down, got behind the insane feminist movement and suddenly our families began to fail, our birthrate fell, and America went from being extremely healthy, to being very ill. The transformation was quite rapid.

Today? We are on our last legs. In another 20 or 30 years the difference between the USA and Mexico will be very small. It gets worse every year, and still we keep drinking the feminist Kool-Aid.

In the great scheme of things, chess is really unimportant. But your country, your children, and their future are in the balance, and these things are not unimportant, at least to me.⁶⁴

"MEN GOING THEIR OWN WAY" (2 JUNE 2017)

Here we are in 2017, twenty years after I started this web page. The bulk of the kids growing up today have no context for the ideas I put forward at the beginning. They watch movies where little toothpick models kick the snot out of powerful well trained men, and the kids think they are watching real life. When they see a real video of what happens when a so-called tough woman goes up against a truly tough man, they refuse to absorb the fact that she is

demolished, usually in only seconds. They continue to think that women warriors are a great idea, with zero facts to back it up.

In fact they don't process facts at all; they instead process movies, TV shows, and news propaganda only far enough to store it away in memory for use when it comes time to make decisions for unimportant things like voting, whether or not to get married, whether or not to have sex before getting married, and if so, with how many others, and of course to regurgitate their confusion into their social media of choice. There is no thought required, because they, and all their friends, have been told what to think, and why should they do the work of thinking for themselves, especially when that might get them ostracized from their group of brainwashed friends?

The feminists, with the help of big government, have steamrolled over our society, leaving it in ruins. But even worse, the kids think this is all normal. They have no clue what life was like when America was healthy, before the marxist openly took over in the 1960s.

How can you help a patient to get well, when he doesn't even know he is sick? Our families lie in pieces on the ground, and the ones who are coming into the age where they should be getting married, aren't doing it. The native Americans, the people of European descent who created America (remember there was no America until the White man arrived on this soil) are failing to reproduce and their numbers, both absolutely and relatively, are falling like a rock. White people will be effectively gone by the start of the next century, and then who will you blame for all your troubles?

The results of feminism, have been so profound that YouTube, which didn't even exist when I started this page, now has people, especially women, who laughingly call themselves "anti-feminists." Each of them, in true conservative fashion, starts off by saying she is completely in favor of all the marxist changes that have occurred already. However, she then goes on to say that she is opposed to the new changes the marxists are promoting today. She ridicules these changes as being absurd, wrongheaded, and way off the mark. But will she turn around and look at the horribly destructive changes that have already occurred and then realize that they too were absurd, wrongheaded, and way off the mark? No she won't.

They point out the absurdity of calling America a "rape culture" and cry out against the "slut walk," and "save the nipple" cam-

paings—and rightly so—but they are right onboard with having the family smashed to pieces, by having women in the workplace. They love women voting and leaving their kids in daycare. They themselves run off to college and laugh it up with their YouTube friends in being the spokesmen for the "anti-feminist" side. They use vulgar terms as if it were formal English, without a single thought about what it might mean to be a civilized lady.

If this blather were not so deadly, it would be funny. The problem is that the traditional American family is not only dead, it is even vilified as being evil and oppressive. The very idea of a woman staying at home to raise her children, being supported by a man, who is working hard for his family, is so alien to them that you might as well be describing something from another planet.

It is a universal curse of the conservative that he is destined to wander in the desert wilderness of ignorance all his days. For his entire life he will think that the marxist tool Martin Luther King was a good man, no matter how much evidence comes out against the man. They are destined to think that the changes of the 1960s were good, but further change would be bad. It is a form of insanity that is almost impossible to cure, for the ones who are afflicted with it, find they are encouraged in their sickness by almost everyone in society, whether they are from the left or the right. The anti-feminist of today is not.

But of course, once embraced, the insanity of feminism had to create a massive group of disassociated males with no role in life. It was only natural that they would in time coalesce into some form of organized existence. And YouTube has given voice to that process, in the form of MGTOW (Men Going Their Own Way). Rather than a touchy-feely approach to the insane world of feminism, this is the masculine version, or the flip-side of the same coin. The MGTOW views women as predatory animals, who are using their wiles to trap men, only to get their own way.

The problem of course is that they are right in many of their assertions. Biology has made men and women incredibly different. Anyone with any sort of mind left to him can see that a woman wants different things from life than a man does. Talking with most women is a very different experience than talking with most men, aside from the sexual tension that comes from cross sexual conversation. Women reason differently. They view the world differently.

So, naturally, if a man sits down and thinks about that, he could view it as being evil or manipulative and selfish.

Sadly, too often it ends up as if that is exactly what women are about. A man gets married and his world is destroyed, as his wife has a baby or two and then walks out on him. He is left in debt slavery, with impossible child support payments, and a life in ruins. For what? Feminism has created this method for marriages to fail, and the MGTOW blames the women, who have unfortunately embraced the concepts they have been spoon-fed from the day they were born.

But to be fair to women, what else could they do? They cannot play the hand they were dealt fairly, as they did with the traditional family. Instead they have to cheat. Women are not men. As a group, they will never successfully compete against men at doing manly things. This is shown every day in the workplace, which was invented by, and for, men.

After decades of the government crushing our businesses into a feminist mold, we still hear howls about the "wage gap." How on earth could there be a "wage gap"? Women are given preferential treatment from the day they are born, all the way through school, and into, and through, every day they work in the workplace. Companies are rewarded for perpetuating this obvious, and proudly admitted, discrimination against men. And still, we hear that there is a "wage gap."

But, at the very same time, they never can point to an example where a woman, who is doing the very same job—that means producing the same amount and quality of work, and putting in the same number of hours on the job, while missing no more hours from the job for personal interests, such as family and sick children—is earning less money than a man in the same position. First of all that would be illegal, and they know it. This is a straw-man that they have created in their minds that doesn't exist in reality. Where wages differ, so does performance, and they know it.

The only reason, and I repeat, the **ONLY** reason that feminism didn't fall into the dust under its own stupid weight, is because the government has promoted it shamelessly and provided a system to prop it up and crucify anyone who opposes it. If the government had remained neutral, and the courts had not been used as a hammer to destroy our society, feminism would have gone nowhere. Sadly, that is not the case.

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

Women throughout history have used their feminine charms to acquire what they want from men who are physically stronger. Biology could not allow men and women to both go their separate ways, as feminism, and its natural offshoot MGTOW, are having them do today. If the sexes go separate ways, the race dies, and so the story ends. Anyone who doesn't understand this is a fool, whose biological line will come to a fool's end.

For there to be a next generation, women have to have babies and to have babies they need a man. For the babies to be raised well so the next generation won't turn into iPhone-toting-dysfunctional-freeloaders, mothers not only have to have babies, but they have to raise them with the help of the fathers. This is *The Birds and the Bees 101*. It is so basic that almost no one ever questioned it until the marxists shoved the opposite down our throats.

This isn't women's fault, and it isn't men's fault; it is feminism's fault, or more correctly, the fault of the marxist pigs behind the whole movement who have used their control of the media, and thereby their control of the government, and its schools, to change how America thinks about marriage and families.

There is a reason why the traditional family existed during the entire time America rose to greatness, and why America's greatness has been falling to pieces ever since she rejected the obviously—based upon past performance—correct path. If you don't open your eyes and search out the truth on this, there is no hope for the future. None at all.

Think about it. White Americans stopped having babies. The number of White people in the country, which they created, is now less than it was last year, and the year before. But at the same time, because of the massive invasion of non-Whites into America, the overall population is exploding, faster than it was during the so-called "Baby Boom" years. It is also true in Japan, where they have embraced the feminist nonsense, and their population size is decreasing alarmingly. Do you understand what this means? Feminism destroys entire populations!

In just a few years you will not be able to tell the difference between the USA, and the countries to the south. If you think that is a good thing, why haven't you moved down there to enjoy all those wonderful benefits right now? Why wait?

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

The feminist game is to claim continual victimhood and get more and more concessions from the government, which in turn inflicts them upon men, and even upon the women who would rather live a traditional lifestyle. The MGTOW game is to separate men from women, so that women can't play their game on the men. In case you haven't figured it out yet, these are both losing games, and the impetus for them both came from the so-called philosophy of feminism, put upon us by people who want us to fail.

Pay attention, before it is too late. It is twenty years closer to that time than it was when I started trying to get your attention. Think about it.⁶⁵

"HALF WAY THERE" (4 AUGUST 2017)

Your ship is wrecked, you climb into a lifeboat, and there it is, land! Now you begin to row, and you row, and you are half way to the shore. Are you going to make it? No, you will never reach that shore. Why? Because suddenly, you turn and start to row in a circle. Round and round you go, and you have determined that you plan to go no farther, not ever.

I suggest that this is an analogy that fits the MGTOW (Men Going Their Own Way) mindset. They realize that just staying put is a death sentence at the ship that is going down. Feminism has wrecked Western Civilization utterly, and it has reached out its deadly touch to all countries who have tried to emulate the West, for example countries like Japan.

Feminism disallows acceptance of reality. Feminism demands that you pretend that a woman is the same as a man: the two sexes are composed of interchangeable individuals, where any woman can be replaced by a man and any man can be replaced by a woman, and there will be no negative consequences, once culture has been extinguished entirely, leaving no imprint upon the individuals living within it.

Think about that assumption for a minute. Even if you insanely assumed that it is true, what do you have left when your culture is utterly destroyed? Do you really want to live in a society like that? If you say that you do, you have no idea how much culture defines your life, and how alienated you would be without it. Nothing you take for granted in life would remain.

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

And of course that feminist assumption is false, and you would be giving up everything you value for absolutely nothing. Many studies have shown the foundational claims of feminism are not only off a bit, they are diametrically opposed to reality. Men are not only slightly different than women, they are drastically different. Mothers and fathers are different, and they are both needed by children for a healthy upbringing. Why? Because the different influences each parent has on a child must be balanced inside a family for a child to grow up straight and whole.

By letting the state replace the man in a home, feminism has destroyed the actual influence of the male adult in the lives of children, and the results have been catastrophic.

It is a massive mistake to blame either women or men for this situation. Either attempt will lead you to a dead end. No matter how much you beat or shape a person of either sex, you cannot make that person into the other sex. We are biologically programmed to fill our sexual role, and the roles can never be the same, because the sexes are not the same.

So, why are men crushed by the court system? Is it women's fault? No it is not. In point of fact women have had little to do with the changes in the court system. Is it men's fault? Have men failed to try hard enough? No that is just as wrong. The men of MGTOW have found their way half way home. The system that feminism has created has sunk our societal ship and we can no longer rely upon trying to make it float.

What is the solution? If it isn't men or women who sunk our ship, who is at fault? How can we paddle our lifeboat all the way home to safety?

Before you can destroy an enemy and win the war, you must know whom your enemy is. Who is it that undermined our families and pushed feminism down our collective throat? In the 1950's and early 1960's the vast majority of women were dead set against feminism. They openly stated that they were not "Women's Libbers." The very idea revolted them. And yet that revolting idea was forced upon us all from above.

From above also comes the entire brainwashing agenda that the public school system must follow, and part of that poison includes complete indoctrination into the unholy order of the devotees of feminism. Girls are raised to be feminists in their aims. In fact even

the ones who claim to be "anti-feminists" are dyed in the wool feminists, who think that it is right and good for women to vote, and to work along side of men, doing the same jobs (sort of).

Meanwhile, these "equal" women either don't produce children at all, or have the ones they do produce stuck in a day care center, where someone else will raise them during the day. At night, Mom is too tired to deal with the kids, and so these working mothers turn those precious minds over to the Media Monsters, by flipping on the TV set. Who has time or energy to read to the kids, or to play games with them?

Since the media and the schools are controlled by the same Marxist jerks, naturally the entire day of children is saturated with more feminist and egalitarian nonsense, and then we wonder why the kids are so messed up.

So, I ask you, is the solution to "drop out," like the acid dropping, pot smoking hippies did, to run away and hide, as MGTOW is doing? Is it for women to rely on the state to let them pretend they can do anything a man can do, like the feminists are doing? These things are problems to be solved, and they are not solutions to any problem—other than the one our masters have, in trying to overthrow our society completely, so they can claim it for their own.

Convincing men to quit may seem like a good idea, and it might help one generation of men to live a life that is better than the choices they might have otherwise made. However, it is no solution to the overall problem.

The court system needs to be changed. The laws need to be changed. And for goodness sake the stuff you feed your children's minds needs to change. Girls need to be wives and mothers or it all ends. Boys need to grow in to solid husbands and fathers. If this doesn't happen, nothing else will ever matter.

It is time to stop playing "let's pretend," and face the cold hard facts of life. Our government has to change. No-fault divorce has to disappear, because it spits in the face of justice. A man must be allowed to marry a woman safely, without worry that she will walk away on a whim, and destroy his life by stealing his money and his children without just cause. A woman needs to know she can safely marry a man and he will not abandon her and leave her and their children impoverished. The laws of all Western countries need to reflect the traditional values of our people, and to remove every taint

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

of the Marxist sewage that controls them now. Socialism needs to disappear. Feminism needs to be destroyed.

Basic human psychology demands that if you want more of some behavior, you reward it. If you want less of some behavior, you penalize it. Our government should be rewarding families who stay together. There should be penalties attached to either producing children outside of wedlock or for breaking up a marriage without just cause.

What would happen if we got rid of easy divorces—anyone getting divorced has to show just cause: adultery, physical assault, abandonment—and then levy taxes at half the standard rate across the board for families who remain married, and have two or more children? You get the point. If you make it very good for people who do the right thing, and very bad for the people who don't, you will end up with a lovely garden of good behavior, and far less of the weeds of bad behavior.

Feminism produces nothing but weeds, and MGTOW is abandoning the garden entirely. These are both problems, not solutions. What we need is very different than either of these.⁶⁶

“THE BLACK PILL: THERE ARE NO RED OR BLUE PILLS FOR WILLING VICTIMS” (14 JUNE 2017)

I have been watching a lot of YouTube videos, by commentators who claim to be anti-feminist or Men's Right's Activists. They are mostly done by young people who are either of college age, or a bit older. And it is downright scary to see where things have fallen too. These are the ones who are supposedly against feminism, and in support of men. They aren't, in either case.

It is said that someone takes the Red Pill when he has his eyes open to how bad men have it. I watched a movie called The Red Pill and was amazed. It wasn't that it made sense, but in the way it continued on down the same path to destruction that feminism put us on decades ago. What do the MRA's want? Victim status. That is the only viable currency in this Marxist state today; if you aren't a victim you have no rights at all. Now males want the same victim status that women have.

Most of what they called abuses of men are just the things that any man worth his salt would accept as part of being a man. Yeah,

you go out and sweat out a living to support your family. You let the women and children go first when your ship is going down. Why? Because children are the future of your society, and they need their mothers to take care of them.

All the talk about Red Pills and Blue Pills is utter nonsense. When it comes to playing the sexes against each other there is only one pill, the Black Pill, the pill of death. Death to your society, and all that you care about.

There was one bit of humor in the movie though. The woman who was creating the movie interviewed the lame Marxist feminist (I know that's redundant) who runs MS. Magazine. The interviewer asked the publisher about why men have no reproductive rights. The idiot had the guts to say that a man has the right to not have sex, or to use contraception, and that is where his rights end.

HOLY COW! I couldn't stop laughing. Sure it was graveyard humor, literally, but that is the exact same argument that feminists like her used to go ballistic over, when civilized human beings told her that a woman has the right to not have sex, or she can use contraception, but she doesn't have the right to murder her child in an abortion clinic. It was quite gratifying to watch and listen to, as this lying jerk said it, right out of her own mouth. What a hypocrite!

I am sick to death with an entire generation of losers fighting to get to the top of the victim heap. "Look at me, I am oppressed." "Oh no, look at me instead, because I am oppressed even more." Whoever wins this losers' game is still a loser. What a humiliating pit this country has sunk into. The only thing left is to shovel the dirt over our rotting collective corpse.

Let me give you a real Red Pill and see if you can get it down your whining victim's throat. Biology is sexist. Get over it! Women are way different than men. Men are way different than women. End of story. The facts aren't going to change, no matter how many idiots you get to agree with you on how bad you have it because you are woman or a man.

When America grew up into greatness, it was because women were at home with the kids. It was because men married women before they got them pregnant, and they hung around to support their wives and their mutually conceived and parented children. They had a home together and they shared life together and in the end they were buried side by side in a cemetery together and their

children were there to mourn their passing. When children went outside to play the entire neighborhood was their babysitter because up and down the street were mothers who watched out not only for her own kids but the neighbor kids as well.

They had large families, more than three children per household on average and our population of native Americans was growing rapidly. And because of that our demographics didn't change much over the years. If you walked down a city street in 1900 you would see the same sorts of faces that you would see on a city street in 1950. Why? Because we were having children to create the next generation. And because mothers were home and fathers stayed married to them, the children grew up with manners, a respect for their society and culture, a knowledge of what was right and wrong, and a strong desire to do what was right.

Feminism was never about making things good for women; it was about destroying the nuclear family, to weaken a country that was otherwise free and too strong to defeat. That was feminism's only purpose, because Marxist don't care about anything but their own power. And it worked like a charm. They couldn't take America over by force, but they still found a way to take us down.

Just look at their fine work. We now have women who are "taking care of themselves," by being single mothers—who are mostly taken care of by the government, not by themselves—who produce one or two children, who are destined to fail. The crime rate, and the school dropout rate for their kids will be way higher than it would have been if they stayed home and their husbands supported them, but by golly they don't have to rely on a man. No sir. And since feminism destroyed our birth rate, as all the experts are happy to tell you, their kids are going to grow up as aliens in what should have been their own land, since with our low birthrate, invaders have come in to take over, and they don't want no stinking Gringos in their way. But that's okay, because these "liberated women" don't have to rely on a man.

What these short-sighted ladies don't understand is that once the invaders take over completely, all this feminist nonsense will evaporate and women will get the standard third world treatment, and my guess is that they are not going to like it.

The only way to make any society work is for women to do things that women are good at, and for men to do things that men

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

are good at, as we did before the feminist liars took over. Now, we have women doing things that men are good at, and men doing things that women are good at, and everything is falling to pieces. But it's okay. We can live in a third world ghetto, just as long as we get rid of those terrible traditional families.

You might try a large glass of water to wash that Red Pill down, but my guess is you won't be able to swallow it anyway.⁶⁷

"THE MYTH OF FEMINIST WAVES" (8 OCTOBER 2018)

Something that I have noted today on YouTube is that all the so called anti-feminists are just the opposite of what they claim. They almost universally (MGTOW and a few other exceptions exist) accept as fact that all the damage done by feminism in the 20th century is a good thing and only the current insane antics of the radical feminists of today are to be condemned.

This is done by people who are otherwise sharp witted and intelligent. But as I have pointed out before, if you start from an invalid set of assumptions, even using impeccably sound logic will only lead you to false conclusions.

All feminism is one movement, not waves of movements. The radicalized women who pushed through the insane 19th Amendment were cut from the very same cloth as the morons marching naked in slut walks today crying about rape culture, the wage gap, and the patriarchy.

What everyone seems to be missing is that there is no real goal for these feminists. There is no point you can reach that will satisfy them so they will sit down and shut up. They will continue to whine and complain about the state of affairs as long as there continues to be a state of affairs that retains enough structure of Western civilization to sustain their existence. What they want is the collapse of society, and once they have attained that they will be left with a pile of rubble which the Marxist hope to shape into a pile of power for themselves. The fact that both women and men will be left in chaos, poverty, and oppression doesn't matter to them and it never has.

When the United States came into existence even men didn't have the vote universally. Only male land owners could vote. Why? Because you want educated men who know something about how the government works, and who are able to vote wisely to choose

your leaders and to decide what goes on in your country. Over the years this sane and correct approach was cast off, and they insanely gave the vote to all men. Today, the moron and the genius are treated as having equal say in how the government should run, and that is demonstrably unworkable. The quality of men who have been elected, since this change occurred, has fallen into the dirt, and it remains there.

Giving the vote to women has in no way improved the quality of government, and anyone who inspects the history of the US knows it. A Marxist minded man like Franklin Roosevelt would probably never have been elected if not for the mistake of giving women the vote. This jerk glibly referred to the greatest mass murderer of all time in Europe as "Uncle Joe," and proudly was shoulder to shoulder with Stalin during World War II, and did his best to help make all of Eastern Europe safe for communist rule.

If you look at the women who were marching for "women's suffrage" you will find them to be the same collection of man-hating scoundrels that today are behind the marches, and who make up the collection of random noise machines laughingly called feminist thinkers and philosophers. This is not a new wave of feminism; it is the same old incoherent package of feminist lies.

No one can honestly say that having the vote for anyone today is going to make things better. If you look at the path the country is on, there is no way a happy outcome is possible, no matter how you vote. There is nothing positive left to vote for, so your vote is meaningless. Feminists get their back up when intelligent women like Ann Coulter state for the record that women should not have the vote, but most of them don't understand why she said it, or truly why it upsets them.

The feminist movement was set back by World War II, because there was no way women could go out and fight like men could. This was a real war against a powerful enemy and Barbie Doll soldiers would have just gotten in the way. The leaders of the feminist movement were more interested in destroying Germany than they were about domestic power for the moment, so they shut up and let the Marxists win the war. The one area they were continuing to work was to try and get as many women as possible working in factories to set a precedent they thought they could use later. The jerks are still using that moronic poster.

Once Stalin was safe, they set back to work to undermine our society, and its sound traditional sexual roles once again. They couldn't know that television was coming to their aid, but when it was clear that TV was about to flood the country the scoundrels grabbed onto it immediately. Every one of the three major networks were in their hands from day one.⁽¹⁾ And bit by bit they used this incredible propaganda machine to promote the ideals of marxist feminism ubiquitously.

Today virtually everyone buys the lies the media has sold them, including the one that says feminism is a good thing. One of the clear indications that this is strictly brainwashing from propaganda is the way it is unassailable. To question the propaganda is now termed *hate*, and, also thanks to the propaganda, everyone "knows" that *hate* is inherently evil and must be crushed. You actually hear people say that free speech is good, but *hate speech* should be censored. They actually can say that without seeing the incredible irony of that position. This view can't be sustained because anything can be labeled as *hate speech*. Therefore, if you can ban speech simply because you label it in some fashion, then free speech by definition is also banned.

Today nearly all commentators of all stripes, agree to the insane proposition that things have progressed since the 1950s for women. If you define walking up the 13 steps to a gallows as progress, perhaps this position could be defended, but otherwise it is pure rubbish. Women in the US in the 1950s were having more than 3 babies each on average and our society was growing in a healthy fashion. Men were marrying women and they stayed around to support the family and join in with the rearing of the children. Mothers were home supervising the raising of children and even the neighborhood was a better place for children because mothers were home up and down the street, so a child would be watched wherever he might be at play. To say these women were any less happy than the women of today is an assertion put forward without any supporting evidence, and as Christopher Hitchens pointed out, anything that is asserted without evidence can be safely rejected without evidence.

But let's cut this all the way down to the foundation. The raw assertion that all this nonsense is based upon is that men and women are equal. Are they? No they are not. And everyone knows this. You

know it yourself. If men and women were the same thing there would be no such thing as feminism would there?

Sports are a good example of the differences in the sexes.

Decades ago I was disgusted by feminists using a grammatical term incorrectly to discuss the sexes. Sex is a biological fact. Gender is not. Gender studies is not an accurate name for women's studies or studies concerning the sexual roles in society. Mountains and chairs have gender in some languages. But they are not biologically male or female. It was merely incorrect usage of English at first but today it has become clear why they did it. Now they can discuss having more than two genders, because they are not talking about sex, but mental aberrations. Gender is a state of mind to them, while sex is clearly defined and can't be debated. But I digress.

From the Olympics to professional sports you see that they have separate events for men and women. Why? Because men and women are not equal in sports. Men are better and everyone knows it. If men and women were equal, there would only be one category for each event. If you had a 100-meter race, that would be it for that event. But you have the men's 100-meter race and the women's 100-meter race. And the medals for the two events are counted as being equally valuable.

Women are paid huge amounts of money to compete with each other in tennis, when even the best of them couldn't play competitively with the top two or three hundred men. If they are equal, then why do we pay them such high salaries for inferior play? Most men watch women's tennis to see women running around in skimpy outfits, not because the play is top drawer. Online you can find incredibly numerous sites and YouTube channels dedicated to showing pictures of the sexiest female athletes taken with the women in compromising poses as they play whatever sport they are engaged in. If you want to see the best play, you watch the men, but if you want to see sexual beauty, you watch women play. The female sports that are the most popular are the ones that show the most skin. This is not equality.

Even games that require no physical strength leave women in the dust. Both Chess and Go are games of the brain alone, and yet women are unable to compete effectively against the top men in ei-

ther one. They have women's events, and titles and they get paid for playing at a lower level as though they were playing at the same level as the men. Women can play in men's events but men can't play in women's events. And of course everyone knows why. The sexes are not equal.

Everyone knows this and at some level accepts it. They live in cognitive dissonance where they know that the sexes are unequal, but at the same time continue to demand that everyone accept that they are. It is absurd but they demand it just the same.

Men and women have different strengths and different weaknesses. They are complimentary not competitive. Men compete against men for women and women compete against other women for men. The methods of competition are different but they are fought with a great deal of energy in both cases. Feminism claims none of these differences exist and we are all the same. It makes these claims without evidence for their position and in the face of a prohibitively large amount of evidence against it.

Think of this analogy, you have a bar of gold and a large diamond. The market value for each of these items is identical. They are equally valuable. However, they are not equal. Equality means you can swap the two and one could supply all the qualities of the other. If you have one, it is the same as having the other. However, only their market values are equal. You can use gold in electronics to conduct electricity, and you shape it easily into many shapes. It is far superior to the diamond if you used it for a paperweight. The diamond is hard and can cut glass and other things where a cutting utensil of gold would fail miserably.

Feminism is effectively making the claim that the two sexes, which are clearly different, like gold and diamonds are different from one another, are absolutely interchangeably equal.

If it were just feminist noise we had to deal with, it would be a non-issue. Freedom of speech allows for stupid speech as well as intelligent speech. So, feminists would do little harm if they were held to merely publishing their silly ideas in whatever format they chose. Why feminism is truly a problem is the fact that they have been able to hijack our government and to change the laws to line up with their insane, wrong-headed ideas. They are marxists at heart, and like all good marxists they want to undermine the society. A great deal of their rhetoric is clearly aimed at this very thing. If

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

you listen closely they are talking about change, constantly, and whatever change has already occurred is mentioned only in passing, before they demand more change. They have more than they asked for by the suffragettes or even the radical jerks in the 1960s who burned their bras in protest, in a logically flawed and truly insane attempt—at least this was their claim—to stop men from looking at their breasts. Somehow wearing underwear was considered oppressive.

What is called *First Wave Feminism*, changed the constitution to give women the vote. What is called *Second Wave Feminism*, forced laws onto society that destroyed the freedom of employers to hire whomever they wished to hire, and unleashed a tidal wave of lawsuits and harassment claims upon our society. Suddenly, the Fragile Female was shoved into the man's world of business and they couldn't take it. So, one after another court rulings, followed by legislation that post-dated the rulings with laws of the same bent, and today you can't go to the bathroom without some law or ruling being either complied with or violated.

If you take away all the legal damage that feminism has done, including the legal slaughter (since murder is a crime, and abortion is legal it can only be called execution, not murder) of literally tens of millions of innocent children in the womb, then feminism is just harmless noise. But because the government was taken over on this issue, today feminism is one of the most destructive forces to ever hit any country in history. It has killed far more people than the Black Death or the Crusades or the Spanish Inquisition. The number of aborted babies is rapidly passing up the number of people killed in both World Wars, and soon will rise above the number of all people killed in all wars for all time.

Beyond the simple murderous brutality of feminist activists, there is the fact that women in the 1950s were creating the next generation of Americans, English, Germans, French and even Japanese. American women were producing babies, and they were at home raising the babies into adulthood. Today, thanks to feminism the birthrate has fallen off way below replacement levels and all the countries that have embraced feminism are either dying of population anemia, like Japan, or immigration invasion like the US and Europe. Once the formally White nations are predominately non-White the entire culture will be wiped away and replaced with the

COLLECTED ARTICLES 1997-2018

culture of the invaders. Why should they want to live like us, when they have the power to live in their own culture? Why speak English (or German or French) when the invaders have become the majority? And of course you can easily see the hatred that all the new arrivals have for Whites, especially White males.

Who do you suppose benefits by pulling down the very ones who created this wonderful country and its wealth? Why do you vilify White males? In order to take their power away so you can overthrow the system. This is basic, and clearly stated Marxist ideology.

Feminism is not made up of different waves, in the sense that there are different feminist movements and you can pick and choose which one you support. If you support what is called *First Wave Feminism* or *Second Wave Feminism*, then you give support to *Third Wave Feminism* as well because they are all based on the same foundational premise: *women are exactly the same as men*. It is absurd and everyone who is sane knows it. If you suddenly forced women to compete with men across the board equally women would almost completely disappear from sports. If you forced them to take charge of their own lives rather than having the government subsidize their existence they would find that being a wife and mother is a really good deal, and that the women in the 1950s were not oppressed after all; they were privileged.

How many women do you suppose would want to be drafted into the military and have to go off and fight wars against their will, the way men have done for centuries? How many women really want to jump into manual labor jobs, working in the sewers, collecting garbage and dying as steel workers and doing other hazardous jobs? Feminists don't care if men are doing almost all of the dying in the workplace. They still expect men to pick up the check for dinner and they want men to let women and children get on the lifeboats first. Even they don't believe a lying word they are saying.

As with all Marxist drivel, feminist rhetoric is intended to follow the dictates of their perverted daddy, Karl Marx in his communist manifesto:

"In short, the Communists everywhere support every revolutionary movement against the existing social and political order of things."

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

Read it and weep, because that is what all the movements these people have put over on us are about. They don't care about women, Africans, homosexuals, transgender people or anyone else but themselves. They support these movements that undermine the normal functioning of the society, the "status quo" because that will weaken the society so that it can be taken over.

I just wish people would for once get it. This is not about all these causes. The causes, all of them, are only tools that these creeps use to take you down. America was apparently unassailable in the 1950s. It was easily the most powerful nation on Earth, and through the Marxist agitation for all these causes, we were destroyed from the inside out. The West is in decline because it was pushed into decline on purpose. If you have had your mind twisted into thinking that unequal things are truly equal, then you are part of the problem, and you will remain so until you wake up and smell the coffee.⁶⁸

COLLECTED EMAILS

1997-2000

CHAUVINIST CORNER GUEST REGISTRATION – 1997-1999

Name: Dot

Website:

Referred by: Word of Mouth

From: Northwest

Time: 1997-10-03 15:08:00

Comments: What a Wonderful Web Page and how refreshing to hear a REAL man talk about taking care of his woman. I'm passing the word.⁶⁹

Thanks Dot! -Al-

Name: Joe Pierre

Website: Conservative (Right-Wing Radical Redneck) Page

Referred by: Word of Mouth

From: Salem, Oregon

Time: 1997-10-05 02:12:00

Comments: Glad to see you have a Guest Book. Watch out for Lpage, though. If they crash, they take your entries with them. I finally made my own Guest Book. All the entries go through me, so I can correct misspellings, punctuation, and screen the foul-mouthed teeny-boppers out. Good luck to you!⁷⁰

Thanks Joe! I love your page, and hope everyone that passes this way will pay it a visit! -Al-

Name: Larry Petersime

Website:

Referred by: From LinkExchange

From: Charleston, S.C., originally

Time: 1997-10-05 19:16:00

Comments: Interesting site. My wife isn't a computer type, but has enjoyed articles I've read to her. I think you've got a site I'll spend time on.⁷¹

I am glad that you and your wife dropped in! This page is made in hopes of promoting marriage for life, happy and filled with love and respect for each other. Feminists will

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

never understand that concept and are only angered when they are confronted by it! Come back early and often!!-Al-

Name: David K.

Website:

Referred by: Word of Mouth

From: Pacific Northwest

Time: 1997-10-06 12:33:00

Comments: Hello Al, I finally made it to your page. Let me read some of it and I will get back to you. Dave⁷²

I hope you enjoy your visit! -Al-

Name: Jennifer

Website: Wynn115's homepage

Referred by: Just Surfed On In!

From: Toledo, Ohio

Time: 1997-10-06 22:26:00

Comments: Just curious, would you consider a woman who has no intention of marrying, or ever having children a failure to her gender? After all, while she's at work, there are no children to be neglected. Just wondering where *truly* independent women stand.⁷³

Jennifer, The number of women, at least non-lesbian women, who can be sure of meeting your requirements is too limited to be a topic of serious discussion.(e.g. How many women *never have sex* in order to completely avoid the risk of having children?) -Al-

Name: Yatsu

Website: Anti-Feminist Page

Referred by: Just Surfed On In!

From: Lansing, MI

Time: 1997-10-20 21:29:00

Comments: Word on my brother. Preach the word. I agree with you on your points...you should work on advertising the page so more people can see. Nicely done. Good points.⁷⁴

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

It is great knowing that feminism has not been completely successful in their disinformation campaign! Thanks for dropping in. -Al-

Name: Ivan Gonzalez

Website:

Referred by: Net Search

From: Colombia

Time: 1997-10-23 14:30:00

Comments: I really against chauvinism. I love women⁷⁵

I love women too, that is why I am a chivalrous chauvinist! -Al-

Name: susan

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfed On In!

From: richmond, va

Time: 1997-11-04 21:27:00

Comments: If there are differences between the sexes, why the value judgement? I admire your honesty and your ability to make a very attractive web page⁷⁶

I think the point of my page is clearly a judgement against feminism but in support of women. I thank you for the kind words! -Al-

Name: Steve

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfed On In!

From: Australia

Time: 1997-11-05 18:42:00

Comments: Al, THanks for the Email! I think you'll agree, Feminism has been around since time began, and currently we are going through a passing phase which will extinguish itself within the next few decades and then things will be back in harmony again. Until then, sit back and watch feminism destroy itself without us men lifting a finger!⁷⁷

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

Feminism is an unstable philosophy which can only self-destruct, but it is impacting the American family in very serious ways. I only hope the foolishness fades before our society does. Thanks for dropping by! -Al-

Name: Matthew L. McCarty

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In!

From: Kilgore, TX

Time: 1997-11-15 22:22:00

Comments: Excellent Web Page sir! One of the best I have EVER seen and perhaps the most important one on the net. Keep up the good work and you can be sure that I will forever fight against those evil forces which are set against us.⁷⁸

Thank you for the positive support for my page! The family is the foundation of any society and feminism is at war with the family! So many women and men never have a chance for a happy marriage, and their children never get to share in the daily love from their own two parents at home because of feminism. America has to wake up before it is too late! -Al-

Name: Dana

Website: Why atheist (feminist reasons)

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In!

From: Mandeville (close to new orleans)

Time: 1997-11-30 12:17:00

Comments: I know that everyone who reads this message will not want to visit my page, but just give it a chance because I read all this chauvinistic stuff on yours, just to hear opinions of people like you. My page is NOT a bible bashing website, so I hope it won't offend any religious people. Anyhow, if you love women so much, then why not let them make their own choices? Try putting yourself in a women's place. I find your pictures offensive, a big hairy "man" dragging a busty woman in a bikini around is disgusting. If I were a guy, and that is what a man was supposed to be, I would refuse to be a "man". And if you plan on e-mailing me at all, don't give me any of this you need a god nonsense, because I've heard it enough.⁷⁹

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

Thanks for dropping by. My page is meant to offend feminists, because their selfish philosophy offends me. If you click on the main picture on my page it links to the explanation of the little guy with the club and his woman. I do not object to women having choices. Feminists do! They condemn anyone who supports women who choose the role of homemaker. Logically it is the first and best possible choice for most women and people like you want to force them to make a different choice. You will note that my page is not a religious page. The only religious trip I take my visitors on is a single small area which demonstrates the complete absurdity of "Christian Feminists." Many atheists were motivated originally to their non-believing position because the Bible is in complete support of patriarchy. I happen to be in support of patriarchy because it works, historically and biologically and feminism does not. Come back anytime! -Al-

Name: Tom -- Golden Stag of Life

Website:

Referred by: From LinkExchange

From: Arlington, VA

Time: 1997-12-03 05:30:00

Comments: Totally great web page. Sometimes I have found the most subversive act possible is using the word "Men" when one is talking in general conversation. I'm active in Men's Movement and New Warrior, which, while not sexist, are organizations which are PRO-Male, although sometimes too apologetically for my taste. Chest Hair Rules! (Or something ultra-macho like that!)⁸⁰

Thank you for dropping by and signing my book! It is, in my opinion, impossible to be "pro-male" in any meaningful way, and to not be sexist. The masculine and the feminine cannot truly interrelate as equals but instead only as two equally important but different parts of a whole. As women attempt to take over the roles which are inherently male, men are pushed out of our society's life, into oblivion. At some point they will become angered. The longer it takes men to fix this problem, the more intense will be that anger. There are dark times ahead. -Al-

Name: Zorko Luka

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

Website: [tribute to "real" women](#)

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In!

From: Slovenia, Europe

Time: 1997-12-03 12:01:00

Comments: Thank you for this really cool page. Reading your articles is a pleasure for anyone who likes women, but hate feminist-chicks. It shows that there are two types of women: 1. Real women, which can be independent and strong, but still feminine. 2. "Woman-liberating", frustrated, nonsense talking, only by biological definition, woman. Keep on the good work! P.S.: Sorry my english is not so good.⁸¹

Glad you came to visit! -Al-

Name: [yatsu](#)

Website: [Anti-Feminist Page](#)

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In!

From: Mars

Time: 1997-12-07 19:30:00

Comments: Bravo, Bravo. Some of your articles *really* hit the spot...exactly the kind of things I want to tell people. Well done, Al.⁸²

Welcome back! Thank you for the inspirational comments! I hope that some of the misguided feminists will see the error of their ways before it is too late! -Al-

Name: [Jolina Crimm](#)

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In!

From: Casper, Wyoming

Time: 1997-12-10 22:51:00

Comments: This might come as a shock, but I am a feminist who agrees with some of your comments. For the most part, women are naturally more nurturing and children cling to their mothers. On average, we are not as physically capable as men. Ideally, if a woman wanted to do a traditional "man's" job, she should not receive special treatment. Yes, a lot of feminists are cock-eyed in their beliefs. Yes, a lot of them are not facing the facts. Feminism will not die,

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

though, because of people like me who take a sensible approach to the whole thing. Men and women are different, but women do have personalities. Not all women are the fragile, nurturing stereotypes that you make them out to be. Some of us are naturally competitive. In general, males may be more so, but that is really a personality trait, and doesn't have much to do with gender. By the way, if you visit any feminist sites, you might notice that they have pages on them about mothering, breastfeeding and marriage.⁸³

Thanks for dropping by. If all feminists were as you are this page would never have been written. Unfortunately, unless saner minds pull in the reins on the fanatics who want to kill homemaking as a profession, push women into the military, police force etc. and continue to sue companies for absurdities, the backlash will ultimately kill your movement completely. You error in assuming that men are not naturally more competitive and aggressive because of their gender. It is the abnormal woman who is as strongly driven as the average male is to compete. They exist but are not the norm. -Al-

Name: Sasha

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfed On In!

From:

Time: 1998-01-01 15:50:00

Comments: I would like to thank you very much for your homepage. My interest in feminism has been rising for awhile now, but there was always this little doubt in the back of my mind - "Come on. No one REALLY thinks all this trash anymore, do they?" Now, I can see, as you have posted it up on the web, that people really still DO believe all the utterly disgusting things I couldn't believe people still did. Your page really quieted any doubts I had. I'm going to submit your page to some of the web pages I visit in hopes of further inspiring those of us who might still be doubtful... Hopefully, by the time my daughter grows up, she'll be able to know no one still holds these types of beliefs anymore - and I will have been one of the strong women that helped fight for her to be able to have that knowledge.⁸⁴

Well, Sasha I thank you for dropping by and for the

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

chuckle. It is true that the radical feminists have managed to bring the strong arm of the government down on those who disagree with them but there are no fewer male chauvinists today than there were before the thought police stepped in. You think that saying that you are strong, makes you strong but it never will. Feminism is unnatural and will self destruct when adversity hits this country. Is is a peacetime pastime that will never survive a real crisis. If you want your daughter to be happy, teach her to be a good homemaker and make sure she marries a Real Man. Otherwise, you are teaching her to believe in fairy tales.

Name: Caesar Squitti

Website: Anti-truths: Truths, Half-truths & Lies.

Referred by: Just Surfed On In!

From: Thunder Bay, Ontario CANADA

Time: 1998-01-03 20:53:00

Comments: Deprogramming the World: Abuse and Anti-truths. C.1997 My name is Caesar Squitti a writer who discovered the negative side to truth, the anti-truth, in addition to correcting the current philosophical definitions of truth, half-truth, and lie. I have done some 10 years of research into feminism, defining such groups as radical-negative-feminism, and documenting their deceptive use of "half-truths" to polarize the sexes and the family. I invite to view the information on page three of <http://flash.lakeheadu.ca/~csquitti/> Providing a link to this site would be appreciated and you are welcome to use the research material to once again promote positive family relationships. It is evident that the entire field of abuse, male/female, or parent/child, has been totally mishandled to the point that it has been manipulated to polarize our society. We have regrettably fallen victim to the deceptive half-truth, or anti-truth, a truth that is a deceptive lie because it is a truth that is part of a greater truth. In the arena of child abuse, models that have been developed by many social and governmental agencies, have polarized the issues by only examining only fathers or parents who abuse children. The logical error is that the scope has generalized and created stereotypes and second ignores children who abuse there parents, other children and themselves. In the arena of male/female abuse the errors are more obvious. Current models focus strictly on violence...which is merely one form of abuse in some cases. Violence

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

can be in response to other forms of abuse, and can be part of complex behavior games, (ie: Dr. Bernes "Games People Play." Tragically we have allowed half-truth based models to exploit our society further aggravating the problem. The systems that have been designed to deal with these problems are in fact contributing to the problems; a paradoxical effect. There is many things to learn from these unfortunate errors. We should not generalize about groups of people nor of individual situations; each is unique. Social programs that address social problems should cross over from merely stopping a negative and promote the positive; if that is indeed there purpose?

Caesar Squitti⁸⁵

In addition to the link to your site above, I have placed one on my links page because I always like to see someone using their mind for thinking as you have. It is such a rare thing to do these days. -Al-

Name: John Dreyer

Website: Conservative Politics Network

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In!

From: St. Louis, MO

Time: 1998-01-12 22:08:00

Comments: What a great site. It is just testimony to my belief that regardless of race, religion and politics, there are only 2 types of people in this world, MEN and WOMEN. If more members of our society could understand and appreciate this fact, and simply respect and accept these differences, many of the modern social problems related to gender would clearly not exist.

John Dreyer⁸⁶

Thanks for dropping in John! I couldn't agree with you more. Thanks for the great link too!

Name: Big John

Website: American Personal Freedom Page

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In!

From: Albuquerque, New Mexico

Time: 1998-01-31 09:04:00

Comments: This maybe the best page on the net.⁸⁷

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

Thanks for the kind words! I think that there is nothing more fundamental to having a safe and solid society than the family. If women abandon the family in search of a career, there will be little safety, or security, for anyone in the long run. Thanks for dropping by! -Al-

Name: Muller du Plessis

Website:

Referred by: Net Search

From: South Africa

Time: 1998-02-10 04:18:00

Comments: I really love this page. It was the only one of its kind I could find. A BIG Hi to all the MCP's out there.⁸⁸

Muller- Thanks for stopping by the Chauvinist Corner! I am glad that you liked it and hope that you come back early and often! -Al-

Name: Chad Morris

Website: Should Women Have the Right to Vote?

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In!

From: Norman, OK

Time: 1998-02-12 21:47:00

Comments: Thank you so much for your web page. It is nice to know that someone in America knows the truth. I especially like your piece on the 19th Amendment. I have a page on the 19th Amendment that I encourage your viewers to read.

<http://www.students.ou/M/Chad.J.Morris-1/>

Thanks again

Chad⁸⁹

Thanks for dropping by! I just visited your page and I thought it was great! Keep up the the good work. -Al-

Name: shianwen

Website: nil

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In!

From: Singapore

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

Time: 1998-02-23 06:47:00

Comments: Button pushing in the army in some bunker far away for women is fine. But carrying a weapon to fight in the front line is not only absurd, but also reduces the ability of the unit to fight, leading to mission failures and extensive loss of life.⁹⁰

Thanks for dropping by! You are absolutely right about women in the front line ranks being an absurd concept! And unless you are out of qualified men, it is stupid to put women in the bunkers pushing buttons, when you can have a far more versatile option at your disposal: What if the bunker is attacked or overrun? Do you really want a bunch of women defending it? I do not think so! -Al-

Name: Cheng Shian Wen

Website: nil

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In!

From: nil

Time: 1998-03-02 04:46:00

Comments: Hi it's me again. You are very right, however, where I live, despite compulsory military training due to the "good iron do not become nails, good sons do not become soldiers" mentality in my country which also has a small population. We still suffer from lack of manpower at some button pushing posts. However, most of the dying is done by us males. Luckily where I live, extreme feminists are rare. Thanks to our leaders who think rationally. There are little or no double standards. In my society you must qualify for the job. Gender is not a factor. I guess that's why there are more female parachute packers than males in my country, as they are neater. It is all about rational thinking and choosing the right gender for the job, instead of giving a "fair" chance to both genders by setting double standards. Oh anyway, VERY NICE PAGE.⁹¹

Thank you for your thoughts and kind words! Thank you also for the information on your country. Singapore is in a very different situation than my country is in. The population of Singapore is about 3.5 million in a total area of 250 square miles. Your country spends about 4.3% of its GNP on defense and has a troop strength of about 54,000 soldiers. My article on women in the military is mostly directed at the US

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

military. The US has absolutely no need of using women in the military at all. The US population is over 267 million people, living in an area of 3,787,319 square miles, with a defense budget of \$253 billion (\$253E+09). We have just over 400,000 soldiers, just under 400,000 sailors, about 380,000 members of the Air Force, 170,000 marines, and nearly 27,000 in the Coast Guard. We have more than enough qualified males to perform all jobs in the military and therefore have no need of having any women in the military for stuffing envelopes, let alone parachutes. Come again soon! - Al-

Name: maddie

Website:

Referred by: Net Search

From:

Time: 1998-03-19 14:44:00

Comments: Here's a question. I just left my husband because he beat me several times for wanting to work outside the home. We don't have any children yet, and if we did I would have loved to have stayed home with them. I don't know what to do. Suggestions?⁹²

Maddie, glad you dropped by. No man beats his wife for any reason other than he is a sick man. (I refer you to The Chauvinist Corner's Axioms of Life item #1.) It is fortunate that you found out about your husband's sickness before there were children to be abused by him. -Al-

Name: Juli Lavooi

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfing On In

From: A whole lot of places

Time: 1998-04-04 16:56:00

Comments: I am a woman, and I agree with your web page 100%. I did not know very many people had the same views as I do, especially men. Most women don't either. I'm glad I found other people who do.⁹³

Juli, It is women like you who hold our society together, while the feminists just pretend that what you are doing is not

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

the most important job in America today! Thank you! -Al-

Name: kristen

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 1998-04-08 07:50:00

Comments: I think that your page is very well-organized and informative. I agree with you that women should not be in the army. I also think that men are more aggressive and competitive than women, but I think that all women should have the choice to work, or stay home and take care of the kids if she wants to. I work in a scientific research lab, and my husband supports what I do. I do not work because I am trying to compete with men, or because I need more money, but because I enjoy doing it. I don't have any children or plan on having any. I also agree with you that some feminists are completely ridiculous. Trying to control everything and making fun of women who want to be homemakers is not a solution, but neither is saying that all women should have kids, stay home and be housewives. I was a housewife, my husband was very loving and supporting, but I decided that I wanted a job. I think that once feminists realize that homemakers are just as important as working women, then society will improve. What do you think of my situation?⁹⁴

Kristen- I enjoyed reading your note and thank you for the kind words concerning my page. As far as the subject of feminism is concerned, we appear to agree more than we disagree. If only women who have never had children, and never will, were working, the number of working women would be small enough to be of no real concern. Alas, not all working women are as thoughtful as you. And you can be certain that there never will come a day when feminists will admit that homemakers are as important as women who work outside the home. It is like the Pope admitting that Martin Luther was right all along. -Al-

Name: Ana H.

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

Time: 1998-04-14 10:34:00

Comments: As long as we have narrow heads, we are going to fight. That goes to feminists too. And BTW... the more I read pages like this, the more I realize that men like you understand women as well as monkeys understand physics, i.e. NOT AT ALL. You will love and praise women in chilvarious manner as long as they are under your feet and doing what YOU think is right. I didn't know God was down on Earth yet. I agree with many essays, the chaos of marriage and other things, but there is a great amount of garbage, simply because you are the monkey trying to convince everyone that you understand physics. Twist and distort the life of women today, Al. I've been a woman in this life far longer than you ever will, and you will never understand the petulance that you so blindly preach in your Holier-Than-Thou view against women who take different paths in life than the ones YOU like. I am a very sensible woman and I don't need to pretend or lie to do what I do today. You are no different than gender feminists, full of so many of their "virtues".

Yours truly, Ana⁹⁵

Narrow heads? Monkeys? Really Ana, name calling and such is a clear indication that your position is weak. I recommend that you read my article [Sticks and Stones](#). -Al-

Name: [Amiable Loafer](#)

Website:

Referred by: From Geocities

From: Spain

Time: 1998-04-21 04:40:00

Comments: Er... wonder if I am missing something. Your argument seems to run as follows: (a) It is a scientifically confirmed fact that men have the edge over women in muscular strength and aggression. (b) Therefore, girls should not play with toy guns, women should not be encouraged to engage in the highly competitive field of work, much less the military, but should instead fulfil their nurturing role as homemakers while men go out to work. Right? Well, the following naturally occurs to me in response: (a) It is a scientifically confirmed fact that women have the edge over men in language processing and production (ask any neurobiologist: they can even do it with both brain hemispheres!). (b) Therefore, boys should

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

not be taught to read or write, men should not be encouraged to enter the highly linguistically challenging field of work, much less politics, but should instead fulfil their aggressive role by hitting each other on the head with clubs while women get on with the business of making laws, writing novels and creating web sites. I do not actually agree with either of the above arguments, but I fail to see why one is better than the other. They are both equally illogical. But as I say, maybe I am missing something.⁹⁶

I recommend you read the [Feminist Flow Chart](#). It might help. Your attempt at simplification to the absurd is quite amusing. It certainly goes without out saying that women can process a lot of language, and humorists have never lacked for material on how much women talk. Of course that says nothing towards the [content](#) of the material that is processed. I should think that you are totally amazed that these women who are so superior to men have been held in subjection for all of history. Of course you ARE missing a great deal. After the entire point of my web page (do the words "family" and "children" ring any bells?), common sense is the thing that is most obvious. -Al-

Name: [Colleen](#)

Website: [Colleen's Feminism Site](#)

Referred by: Word of Mouth

From:

Time: 1998-04-24 07:07:00

Comments: Interesting point of views, interesting content. Though I do feel your definition of feminism is distorted and that you have extremely overgeneralized feminism.⁹⁷

Colleen, thanks for dropping by and sharing your opinion. Think what you might, as feminism has grown, so has divorce. As more women reach for equality, more of them fall below the poverty line. Feminism, no matter how you define it, narrow or wide, is a destructive force on society and especially on women and children. -Al-

Name: [Linda H.](#)

Website:

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Venus

Time: 1998-05-10 08:32:00

Comments: Fine, caveman. Let's repeal the 19th Amendment!! You're absolutely correct in asserting that the Founding Fathers had no desire to see women involved in government. But while we're at it, we're also going to have to bring back slavery (among other things) since the original Constitution sanctions the ownership of people with African ancestry. Let's bring back debtors' prisons, too!! And we're also going to have to dismantle much of our military and national defense: read T. Jefferson a little more closely, Mr. Modern Conservative!!⁹⁸

Miss Linda, So nice of you to drop in. It is too bad that all you got from your visit was being steamed up about women's suffrage. I have made my case for repeal of the 19th Amendment. If you care to make a case for bringing back slavery, debtor's prison, dismantling the military and national defense, you will have to do it on your own web page. Thanks for dropping by. -Al- Caveman extraordinaire

Name: Jenn

Website: whatever

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 1998-05-15 19:56:00

Comments: your guestbook has been signed by a disgusting number of males. i still have a couple questions. for one, why do you oppose feminism if it has no affect on you? why must you attack people like this? and i have to point something out for you, since you are so oblivious to it - *non-feminist does not mean anti-feminist*. i actually consider myself an individualist. i care only about my own needs, i don't need to care for children to feel like i'm accomplishing something. sex is not nescesarily a childbearing procedure. we're not that primitive any more. grow up, the rest of the world has.⁹⁹

Jenn,

Thanks for taking the time to count the number of males who have signed my guest book, even though you found it disgusting. Only a feminist would look at men sharing their

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

opinion as being disgusting. It is that very arrogance which inspired this page!

As to why I attack the idea of feminism, if you had read the articles on my web page you would already know that feminism destroys families, and therefore our society, by not raising the next generation to civility. Feminism is unfair, bigoted and hostile to all that I hold dear. Other than that, I can't imagine why I would oppose it. :-)

As for your non-/anti- point which you seem to think is lost to oblivion, it is answered in I'm not a Feminist. But.... I suggest you read it so I need not repeat myself further.

I thank you for the candid admission that your philosophy is completely self centered, as is that of all feminists. That is why it is so destructive to any society which embraces it. It might help your understanding if you took note of the fact that babies are completely concerned with only their own needs and it is only the act of growing up which changes that. So perhaps you should keep that in mind when you speak of "growing up."

Thanks for dropping by and validating my page in such a fine way! -Al-

Name: Great Spangled Fritillary AKA Lynn Gibson

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfed On In

From:

Time: 1998-05-21 15:48:00

Comments: I've been visiting this page for sometime now and it is my opinion that many of the ideas on this page are EXTREMELY dated. The concept of sexual duality annoys me as much as the suggestion that one race is more athletic or more intelligent than another is race. It drives me positively nuts. I do not believe in sexual duality anymore than i believe in the superiority of one race; it's a ridiculous idea. Gender is a social, not a biological construct, that's why men are conditioned to act like lunky brutes where as women are conditioned to be creampuffs. I do not think that men are unable to nurture and be compassionate, it is society that tells men to behave the way they behave. You cannot say that all women are weak and unable to defend themselves, there's a lot of women who could stand on their own two feet without having to be defended by a man. Furthermore, take a look at all of the sprizthead magazines when

you go to the supermarket. Is it any wonder so many women are wimps? Look at what they're being taught, you, sir are not helping the situation one bit. Also, I think that the extended family is a lot better than the nuclear family. Nowadays we lose touch with the rest of the family except when it comes to terrible events like a death or something, we put grandpa and grandma in the old folk's home and that's not right. The kids could benefit a lot from staying with grandma when they come home from school. She could tell them stories about her life and what it was like years ago and teach them values. The aunts and uncles and other relatives should get involved with taking care of the children. It's better than leaving the kids with strangers. There are circumstances in which two parents have to work and why should a woman just stay home all day? What if the woman wants to have a life outside of the home? If two parents have to work it just seems to make more sense to stay close to other relatives for help. It works for timber wolves. the nuclear family can be so isolated. What makes families stronger is more unity. In conclusion I do not believe that the whole purpose of women is just cooking and cleaning and serving men, i think that that is a ridiculous idea. Women have been fighting for too long now to have what little independence they have earned taken from them.¹⁰⁰

Lynn,

You may disagree with old ideas but that does not invalidate them. I should think that the concept that humans must breathe in order to live predates any idea that is on my page, and yet behold it is truth. The wheel was invented long ago, and yet it is still a sound idea. So are the ideas on my web page!

This page is not about race, although feminists keep trying to change the topic to race. (Anything rather than face the facts concerning the very real, and quite undeniable gender differences which exist in mankind!) I recommend that you read the [Absolute Bottom Line](#) to put your confusion to bed for good. Women are born as different beings than men are, down to the very construction of their brains. The difference is present at birth before any societal programming has been performed! Females are weaker than males and they desire different things than males. I am speaking of the vast majority of women not the small number of lesbians who run the

National Organization of Women. In small cultures where they have tried to eliminate the differences in boys and girls it didn't work! Boys took the dolls that they were given and used them for guns. Girls were incapable of being as aggressive as boys. It is genetic in spite of your ignorance on the subject!

Your tone of ridicule towards women is disgusting! Women are not wimps but rather feminine. A man who acts like a woman is a wimp. A woman who acts like a woman is a prize! Get used to it because it will NEVER GO AWAY! You can't change it because it is inherent in the species.

As for the women's magazines in the store, who do you suppose is buying them and making them profitable? It isn't the men! And after listening to the comments that men make to their wives in the supermarket, it certainly isn't the men making their wives read that material. Women like it! They also like romance novels. Get used to it because it is built in and you and all your feminist friends will never change it. If humanity still exists, 10,000 years from now, women will still be more delicate than men and men will still love football or something like it. Get with the program! You are trying to block the sun with your fist and expecting to put out its fire by such a futile gesture. This is Biology Baby and it ain't going away.

An extended family includes the nuclear family in its center. Today we cannot even hold a nuclear family together, and grandma and grandpa are half way around the world. With serial polygamy so common the extended family is barely more than strangers to most kids. Leave it to a feminist to try to idealize something that will seldom be, in order to destroy the one thing that must be: the nuclear family! A child who has a mother and a father living in the same house, is far better off than one who has no father, a part time mother and fourteen grandmothers and aunts. Are good grandparents a blessing? Of course and I certainly think that a child is better off when he has good, moral grandparents to share stories and guidance. But they will never replace a mother at home with her children on a daily basis. (I agree with you completely that what this society does with our elders is abominable! Our greatest source of experience and personal historical knowledge is thrown away every time a senior citizen is locked away in a home.) While the very idea of turning your kids over to strangers completely disgusts me, and of

course relatives would be far superior to a day care center, yet it still remains true that no relative is going to be a good replacement on a daily basis for a mother at home.

In the Myth of the Two Income Family, I show how that in almost every case where a woman earns a second family income, it is not for the money, and it certainly is not a question of “having to work,” as you and other feminist keep trying to claim. In most cases it is a dishonest claim because feminists know better! It is not the money, it is the perceived higher status of living like men instead of like women. Instead of raising the stature of the mother and the wife, feminists have run the image of the happy homemaker into the ground! They have ridiculed the woman who dedicates her life to her family. They have called her a donkey and a fool. The woman who has worked long hours, spent sleepless nights over her sick children and played games by the thousands with her little ones, is laughed at, and even hated by the feminists. This is outrageous!

Do you seriously think that there is too little support for your ideas of feminism in our government, schools and industry? If so, you are completely ignorant of the totality of support that is given to the insanity of feminism from the oppressive government of this once free land, the public school system, and nearly all US companies. You claim that women have little independence. This is completely ludicrous! Women today are free to be as independent as men are. If they choose not to be independent and instead take another path, and you are determined to affix blame for that choice, don't blame anyone but the women. I do not blame them, but rather applaud the women who choose to put family above the self-centered philosophy that you seem to think is so wonderful. I also applaud the men who are willing to sacrifice to give their wives the opportunity to raise the children in a two parent, single income home. That is the true ideal, and that is what the vast majority of American families could be, if the feminists would get out of the way and let it happen. But feminists would rather see society crash into total chaos than do anything to support families. When that chaos comes, you will see all women look back to these times of freedom with wistful tears, crying because they no longer live in an era where they are free and safe enough to raise their children.

You think that women have been fighting for independ-

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

ence. This is quite amusing! Marching and whining does not qualify as fighting. Women were given all that they have in the area of independence, they took none of it themselves. It can be taken back as quickly and easily as it was given. If you feminists don't wake up before it's too late, you may suddenly be caught in a vicious backlash from the men who are reaching the point of having had enough of your lies, and crybaby tactics, while destroying the next generation, through abortion and mothers who abandon their children for a career.

-Al-

Name: Helaine-Annie Roy

Website:

Referred by: Net Search

From: Sherbrooke, Quebec, Canada

Time: 1999-01-29 12:18:00

Comments: After having read all the comments made by the other visitors I couldn't help myself but post a note. First of all, I would like to congratulate you for your website. I find it very informative and to the point. Your point is consistent throughout your site. To understand where I speak from, you have to know that I was very feminist from age 8 until I reached 24. After that, I started to cool off from all that feminism crap. I realized that my feminist point of view on life and the sexes had sprung from my family life. I mean my mother wasn't happy, my father was a tense and violent man. I was never as good as my brother for him. My brother was never there to help my father with the chores around the house. I would try and help him. I wanted to be with my father. But, he'd always complained that "only if your brother was more like you and be there with me..." I learned early that, in order to be loved by me father, I had to work hard and be like a man. Only then, could I get pieces of recognition. Of course, that was wrong, but you don't think quite logically when you are 4 years old. That brought me to school with only one thing in mind: to succeed and do all the things guys do! When I was 16 years old, I enrolled in the army. It seemed quite a logical thing to do, since all the men in my family had done their military service... See where I'm leading at? Being a feminist (especially a radical feminist) stemmed from my personal drama, not by logical thinking. Many feminists have such personal histories: Simone de Beauvoir, Kate Millett, Susan Brownmiller, Andrea

Dworkin, Germaine Greer... I can't see women as I used to see them. It is feminists who devalued traditional women, not ordinary women or men. What amazes me now is how young men are brainwashed right now... Guys want to be nice. They say they'll support their woman's career and help do this and that. They think they are sweet when they do such. But they don't see the link between radical feminist and the state of our society: abortion rates, contraceptive failures, heart breaks, cynical personalities from personal suffering, single mother (great independence!), divorce, kids with more than two parents, rise in homosexuality, irresponsibility, violence, date rapes, rapes, domestic violence... I personally don't think women today have the choice between work and staying home with the kids (as some of you might say). It maybe especially true in Quebec where feminism hit really hard. Because of a very religious past, the Tranquil Revolution thought it was necessary to evacuate the baby WITH the water from the bath... Result: all our social policies, culture and political climate have been in tune with feminist demands. A woman today who wants to stay home with her kids is seen as a lunatic regressive traditionalist anti- feminist! After all, we have provincial funded care...(5\$ a day). The truth is the economy needs women to work. Women do not have the choice between working full time and sending kids to babysitters or staying at home and care for your kids yourself. I was talking recently with some of my coworkers, one who's pregnant and expecting for this spring. I asked her if she had the choice to stay home and care for her kid and work full-time, what would she chose. She said that she'd rather stay home but she does not have the choice... Free society, hein? Non, mais vraiment! Je commence à croire que c'est une mauvaise blague! So, to all of you who believe women have choices, I'd like to say that it isn't true. Right now, we do not have choices, or if we do have choices: firefighting, army, nursing, teaching or plumber, abortion or not, the pill, IUD, condoms,calendar, spermicides... Please! Enough is enough. Play me another song.

Keep up the good work Al.¹⁰¹

Merci Helaine-Annie! You have elequently stated your heartfelt position and I thank you for it! I too feel that it all must be a bad joke, but too many take feminism seriously instead of laughing. I hope you will drop by again. -Al-

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

Name: Robin

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 1999-02-03 18:24:00

Comments: Thanks for reinforcing my stance as a feminist, and for giving me one of the biggest laughs I've had all day. Pass along my sympathies to your wife.¹⁰²

Robin, thanks for sharing your lack of insight with us. It is quite common that the feminist laughs hysterically at that which she is afraid of and refuses to understand. I would suggest that you read the following Guestbook entry from a very enlightened lady.

Oh yes, my wife says that you should keep your sympathies for yourself, you will need them far more than she. - Al-

Name: Amit Dawra

Website:

Referred by: Yahoo!

From: INDIA

Time: 1999-02-16 10:26:00

Comments: Dear Al, As an Indian male I can fully understand what you guys are going through in AMERICA. Though this may sound funny, as the general image of Indian women is that they are comely, sweet and make obedient? wives. But the F___ing truth of the matter is that the feminist movement came to America in the 60's and to India it has come in only in a period of 5 years and F___ed the happiness of Indian males. Ms., not Miss or Mrs.; sports "person", chair "person", and they don't even change their F___ing surnames after marriage anymore. Now there is inverse oppression in Urban India and women even have reservation to the tune of 50% in Engineering and medical colleges. Sexual harassment laws, "Rape within marriage" are all biased in favor of the "harassed" sex. Even promotions in jobs are given to women unfairly to make up for the "centuries of oppression ." The divorce rate in Bombay and New Delhi (where I come from) have increased 6 times from 1995-1998. I just don't know what the F___ I should do.

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

The F___ing whores have even entered the Armed forces, Pakistani soldiers laugh at our men ,saying that we are scared and thus, have sent women to fight in the army. The "Bharat Ratna"(the most prestigious sports award in India) was given to a F___ing Bird just cuz she's a woman. In my college , in Delhi university, The "womens cell" has it's logo as "MEN ARE LIKE JARS OF MAYYONASE,THEY COME WITH EXPIRY DATES". THERE IS NO "MEN'S CELL" AND EVEN IF THERE WERE WE COULD NOT EVEN THINK OF RECIPROCATING THE SWEETNESS. I SOMETIMES FEEL LIKE CONVERTING TO ISLAM AND LIVING IN U.A.E!!¹⁰³

Dear Amit, Now don't sugar coat it. Tell us what you really think. :-)

You have gone through the same painful and destructive changes in your country as we have in this country but you did it in a much shorter time. That makes the pain more intense, and the possibility of men, and even women, rising up against the outrage is therefore that much more likely. It is a fact of life that slow change can be easily tolerated, even if it is as horribly destructive as feminism is. But a rapid change is harder for people to take and they may do something about it! I hope so for your sake. In America, we seem to be just laying here and taking it. -Al-

Name: Manas Malhotra

Website:

Referred by: Yahoo!

From: India

Time: 1999-02-17 00:52:00

Comments: A big Hello to all those men (and women)who agree with my Guru namely, Al. Al, do you think this perverted movement will continue as it is or maybe intensify, or will men finally get together and fight back? Does this nauseating scheme of things have any chance of coming full circle?¹⁰⁴

Thank you for the high praise! I do think that it is a certainty that feminism will be thrown down in the end because feminism is unnatural. It robs men of their manhood and women of their womanhood. If you tell a fish that

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

it can no longer swim, you will not be ultimately successful. A fish will swim whether you like it or not. A man will be a leader and a woman will nurture children whether feminists like it or not. Additionally, society can never survive the act of abandoning the children to babysitters and day-care centers. A collapse is certain, and with the collapse, women will fall back into the position that they held for thousands of years, while men try to rebuild the civilization once again that feminism destroyed.

My hope is that men and women will awaken and pull themselves Back from the brink before it is too late! -Al-

Name: Umang Goswami

Website:

Referred by: Yahoo!

From: India

Time: 1999-02-17 01:09:00

Comments: I think women who work full time(they do have a right to work if they want) should not have any children.If women want to join the army,Fine,become CEO's, fine again,they are equally competent;BUT they should not have children and then leave them to total strangers, that is very cruel,as children badly need their mothers at least until they reach adolescence. I dont mind if my Boss is a woman,no problem at all,but I DO mind if my wife is pursuing her career at the expense of her (and my) children.Agreed,even men can stay at home and look after the children,but no woman will ever marry a "house husband."Two ambitious people cannot hope to raise a happy family,it is a myth. I don't hate feminists like most men visiting this site, but I still feel that they should not make home makers feel that they are dumb and unproductive human beings.The services of housewives may not figure on the GDP,but it does contribute (a lot)in raising a future generation of happy,and confident adults.¹⁰⁵

Thanks for dropping by and sharing your opinions! -Al-

Name: Asif khan

Website:

Referred by: Geocities

From: Pakistan

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

Time: 1999-02-17 01:10:00

Comments: You idiots in the "western world" are [wimps*]. Come to Pakistan, I'll show you how to control women.^{*106}

I have to admit that I had my friends come and read this one. We had to chuckle, not because what you say is ridiculous but rather because there is a certain amount of truth to what you say. Our men have become far too weak and given far too much of our power to women. It does not make either sex happy when men stop being men. Thank you for your input! -Al-

Name: Shaun Wright

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: South Africa

Time: 1999-02-17 01:27:00

Comments: PAL, I mean you AL, do something. My girlfriend (now my wife) wanted to change her surname to Wright and wanted to quit her job to look after the family (we have two little girls). But there is so much feminist propaganda that she WAS NOT ALLOWED to do either of the above by the council of women's empowerment in Natal (where I come from). It's like one doesn't have a choice as to how one wants to lead one's life anymore, Free world my arse.

Why doesn't somebody put these DYKES out of their misery and let men and women get on with their lives.

Ps: Why are Miss & Mrs. so outrageous nowadays, My mother is Mrs. Wright.¹⁰⁷

Dear Mr. Shaun Wright- Is that Natal, South Africa? I suggest you buy a one-way ticket out of there while you still can. If the feminists don't get you the communists will! Anyplace where the feminists have that much power is in deep trouble already.

The idea that a woman would not be allowed to change her name to that of her husband is outrageous. I think that in the USA, women who do not change their names to the same as that of their husbands, are not really married anyway. They

* [rephrased to eliminate vulgar phrasing]

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

have other concerns which they place ahead of their families which makes them second-rate wives, and soon to be gone.

To force mothers, by law, to abandon their children by not staying home with them is something which only a totalitarian government would sanction. Who in the world are the members of some council to tell you and your wife how to raise your own children and how to live your own lives?

The reason that Miss and Mrs. are so repugnant to the feminists is because these titles indicate the marital status of women. Can you imagine the terrible humiliation of actually allowing people to know whether or not you were married when you gave your name? There is no moral reason why women would want to hide their marital status. It is a traditional difference which our culture has between men and women, which the feminists just can't stand. They live in a dream world where they actually believe that men and women are the same and should be treated the same in every way. It is ridiculous and impossible but they demand it nonetheless. The term "Ms." Is not even a word. It is an abbreviation for "manuscript" but other than that "Ms." is short for nothing at all. It is a word which stems from a twisted and tortured attempt at being equal with men, with no real meaning, just like feminism itself.

I have been watching what has been going on in South Africa since the change of power there and if I had a wife and two daughters I would be getting them out of there as quickly as possible before something dreadful happens to them like what has happened to so many others of your people. Crime is skyrocketing and things are only going to get worse.

I wish you and Mrs. Wright (to blazes with what the Feminists say!) the very best of luck! -Al-

Name: VIKRAM SINGH

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: MUMBAI(INDIA)

Time: 1999-02-27 09:06:00

Comments: Dear Al, I've read the letters of other Indian men who have visited your ashram (yes, I do think it is an ashram). Though you have said that the feminist movt. will eventually die out, I have no such hopes. It's on the increase everyday(at least in Urban India).I plan to come to georgetown univ. for my MBA, but I don't

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

think I'll ever be able to adjust to the "politically correct" atmosphere therefore I'm abandoning the idea. It will be a sad day for USA and indeed, the world if a conniving bitch like Ms.Rodham-clinton becomes the president of America and that seems a realistic possibility with all the sympathy she has been getting for being the "suffering" wife, nobody seems to say a word about "loose lips" Lewinsky. As for women not changing their surnames, it's absurd as it hardly makes a Feminist statement; All surnames in the world are essentially male, so how the f___ is one challenging patriarchy? The family name is one's father's surname, and even if some wise women (some of these sorry bitches dwell right here, in Mumbai) take their mother's surname, it's still stupid as one's mothers surname is the mothers father's surname; PATRIARCHY ALL THE TIME SISTER! Al, give me some hope-a time period perhaps, by when this disgusting phenomenon called FEMINISM will finally die out.¹⁰⁸

Feminism will eventually die out because it is an unnatural movement. It can only survive as long as it is artificially propped up by the government. Men and women strongly opposed feminism when it first hit the USA but the government forced it down our throats, and have been forcing it down our children's throats for a generation and a half. That is the real threat and the source of the real problem. Feminism will die as soon as the government stops supporting it. What intelligent men should do is work towards creating a government which is not so oppressive and which will allow people to choose for themselves how to live their lives and feminism would be gone almost instantly. That is our challenge! -Al-

Name: Vikas Mehra

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: NEW DLHI (INDIA)

Time: 1999-02-27 10:47:00

Comments: Mon ami AL, I'm not surprised that you have become agony aunt to so many males from India. The feminist movement has hit us really hard and shows no sign of letting up. Who is inspiring so many young women all over the world -Mary Wollstonecraft(The rights of woman), Simone De Beauvoir (Le Deuxieme

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

Sex) or the greatest feminist book ever written-"The Female Eunuch"?

Is the bread winner-homemaker role not equal? How come like minded men(and women)like us have to interact on a web site? Why can men not be allowed to express their opinions openly in newspapers or magazines-are they the sole property of lesbian feminists? I think the situation in America(and by demonstration effect, in the rest of the "civilizing" world)is pathetic and has gotten out of hand. Why the hell are so many men supporting these women? I think the institution of marriage should be abolished.

A "double income" and thus "equal" marriage is hell for children-I say that from personal experience-my mother is a doctor and me and my sister(who is ironically, a feminist herself)were raised by a Bai(nanny)-she's the one I call mother, not the bitch who gave birth to me. "Tota mulier in utero"-woman is a womb-that's the only role my biological mother has played in my life. While my opinions may seem to be inspired by my life as a neglected latch key child, I assure you, they are not.

I'm not a misogynist ,but I do despise, loathe, abhor, detest ALL women who pursue careers and have children and leave them to rot in day care centers or with a nanny. The feminist movements goal of creating a unisex world may succeed some day(with women entering even the army now),but you cant alter a man's biological make up. There has to be a male backlash someday, I only hope it happens in my life time. My advice to all like minded men (don't get married to working women if you wish to father any children, you may not realize the torture you and your "better half" will inflict on your children.¹⁰⁹

As nearly as I can tell, feminism has been brought to you by the same lovely folks who originated communism. In the USA, our government is controlled by those who can manipulate the masses to gather in votes, mainly the mass media: television, newspapers, magazines and even movies all work together to propagandize for ideas. They all play off the same score card and promote the same agenda. That agenda is leftist and it is constant, just like the ocean waves, wearing away the resistance of the normal people and their normal ideas. Feminism was promoted into power by the media and those who own it. No American politician can be elected without

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

some help from the media. Those who do not support feminism to some degree will not be elected, because the media will paint them out of the election. So, when the next batch of laws comes out, (surprise!) they increase the support of feminism. Judges are appointed by these politicians. The media insures that the appointees will be supportive of feminism. Suddenly "sexual harassment" suits are going the feminists' way. All sorts of special programs and support laws and ruling come out. School teachers can no longer even voice the opinion that a girl should aim at being a good homemaker, without fear of being fired! That is why you will not find this anti-feminist dialog going on in any newspaper or magazine. It is clear to me that the media, and its leftist owners are the root of the problem. Until they are removed from their position of control, feminism and several other leftist causes will continue to flourish here, and pollute the rest of the world, as well. I highly recommend that you do a web search on the topic of who owns the media and you will put your finger on who is at the heart of feminism! -Al-

Name: Melinda

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: California

Time: 1999-02-27 11:04:00

Comments: Die Bastard, Die. Sons of Bitches like you are becoming an extinct species. Women will win all the custody cases, sexual harassment lawsuits, and lead the us army to defend "her" borders. It's a woman's world now, if you don't like it then die. Who the f___ are you to decide if a woman is a wife or not if she doesn't change her last name? Men are Mr. before and after marriage, so why the hell should women be Miss or Mrs? The future generation of children will treat women with the respect they deserve, I assure you.¹¹⁰

Don't you find it just a little bit funny that the best you can come up with is to insult our mothers by calling them such a name? My mother has always been treated with respect. She didn't need feminism for that. It takes a feminist like you to try and disrespect her, but you aren't even in her league.

That is exactly where feminism lives at. It hates mothers.

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

It loathes the idea of a woman waiting at home with milk and cookies for the kids to get out of school rather than letting the little time wasters take care of themselves.

Hey big talker, who is going to kill us? Time will not do the trick because biology remains when ideology has died. Biology is on my side because biology says women will bear and raise children. Check out history and you will find that is what most women have done ever since there were women. Biology says that men will be aggressive and dominant. Checking history... Guess what? Men have been dominant in every culture which has ever existed! Are you so misguided as to believe that you can physically overcome men? That is too ridiculous for comment!

Movements come and go. A hundred years ago, they would have laughed at the idea of a woman voting. (Since women are the ones who voted in Clinton, and still support him, that was a wise point of view!) A hundred years from today they will probably laugh at the female vote again. Someday when your stupid movement is nothing but a sad footnote in historical records, and women are once again happy in their roles as homemakers and wives they will laugh at the idea that silly people like you ever existed. -Al-

Name: Carl Brother

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: England

Time: 1999-02-27 11:20:00

Comments: Al, I don't like the name of your site. Anti-feminists are not chauvinists. A chauvinist is one who considers women inferior to men, you, Al, like me, do not. You and I only subscribe to distinct yet equally important roles for women and men in society. Death and damnation to all feminists and salutations to women who are proud to be homemakers.¹¹¹

Carl - you have missed the point of the title of my web page, which is the same as the logo: to infuriate the twisted mind of the feminist! It drives them crazy to think of a man in charge. A second point is that women ARE inferior when it comes to earning a living, running a country, pro-athletics and a number of other areas.

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

Men should be in those roles and women should not. That, to a feminist makes me a full blown Chauvinist.

On the other hand, I, like you, think that women are superior to men in the areas of homemaking, child-rearing and family maintenance. It is the feminist jerks who have belittled the role of homemaker to the point where only a "Chauvinist" can say that a woman's place is in the home, even when that means that a home is not a home with out a wife and mother in it. Every person must go through childhood in order to reach the point of being an adult. And only a woman can provide those years with what a child really needs by way of day to day nurturing. That is the single most important human role, job, or career that exists today or ever will exist.

So, my beliefs make me a dreaded Male Chauvinist in the eyes of the lesbian hordes but I wear the title with pride! Thanks for dropping by and sharing your view, with which I agree! -Al-

Name: Michelle

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: fhgfhfgh

Time: 1999-02-27 15:38:00

Comments: F__ YOU A__H__!!!!!!!!!¹¹²

It is refreshing to see a feminist using her entire brain cell with such focus. :-)

Have a nice day. -Al-

Name: Dr. (Mrs.) Anita Pratap

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: India

Time: 1999-02-28 00:36:00

Comments: Hello Al, I want to tell you first and foremost that I used to run an abortion clinic in Mumbai. I grew up with the Bra-Burning feminists of the 60's. However, I have now quit my "profession"-I am 37 now- as all I had been doing for the past 8 years was

aborting, rather murdering babies of school girls who engaged in unsafe premarital sex and wives who had become pregnant with babies out of extra marital affairs. The virgin wife is now a joke in India. Why is it that if a newborn baby is killed, it is murder and if a baby is aborted, it is not? I fully support Pope John Paul-II in his anti-abortion views.

Closet Lesbians and gays(it is still not legal in our country) are adopting babies-in America and England it is legal- Do you think such babies will ever grow up into normal adults?

More than Men I think feminists are against women-they hate mothers, wives who want nothing else except nurturing their families. The problem is that the feminist movt. has really hit us very-very hard, and will make our country another America(no offence meant)as far as family system is concerned.

Lastly, feminists hate the fact that women are treated as sex objects--if women wear tiny, micro mini skirts and the like to attract male attention, how else do they expect to be treated?¹¹³

Hi Anita! Thank you for your candid thoughts. I think that the strongest opponents of abortion are the ones who have practiced it for some time and then it suddenly hits them what they are doing and they pull back in horror at what they have been doing. It is easy for a woman today to get caught up in all the high sounding rhetoric of the feminist, proclaiming that women have been oppressed forever and if only feminism were to be accepted everything would be so much better. Along with that goes the simple but unavoidable reasoning that a woman has a different price to pay for sexual misconduct than men do, and the only solution to that price, the only way to make women "equal" to men sexually is to have legal abortion to wipe away the price that biology has put upon women for illicit sexual activity. Yet the only fly in the ointment is that a human life must be sacrificed each time that price is "wiped away." I can think of few things which would decimate a feeling woman more, than her having the realization, after the fact, that she has killed her own child after having an abortion. I am sure that you have seen that reaction in some of your patients.

Feminism is a heartless monster which is at war with children and at war with the normal and natural instincts of women and men. It inebriates the mind with high sounding

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

rhetoric, and myth, and then points society in a direction which can never work. Over 30 million babies have been sacrificed to this religion of feminism and all its myths. And that is in the United States alone. World wide I have no idea what the numbers are but they must be staggering high.

I am not offended that you do not wish to move your nation in the same direction as America has gone. I am offended that my country has gone where it has! I am hopeful that someday we can undo the harm which has been done. My one true hope, which grows weaker everyday, is that it will not take a bloody revolt to fix things.

Your words are pearls and I thank you for sharing them in my guestbook! I wish you the very best! -Al-

Name: Radhika

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfing On In

From: Mumbai

Time: 1999-02-28 00:48:00

Comments: You stupid s___ face, I'll sleep with a hundred men (and women) if I feel like, who the f___ are you to tell me anything, If I get pregnant along the way, I WILL GET AN ABORTION>It's better to abort an unwanted baby rather than bring her into the world. Women will rule the world in the near future, it's been a man's world for too long the balance HAS BEEN SHIFTING AND WILL PERMANENTLY SHIFT IN OUR FAVOUR. And screw all those emotionally blackmailing fat housewives who have no brains of their own.¹¹⁴

It is sad indeed that such a twisted mind is running loose in society, killing kids and hating normal women. Your lesbian tendencies make normal life impossible for you, so you swing about in hate at all the normal happy people. Vulgarity will not make your life normal. Hatred will not make your life normal but it is all that you have, that and your delusion of female rule. It is truly worthy of pity. -Al-

Name: Father Anil Wilson

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfing On In

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

From: Goa(INDIA)

Time: 1999-03-01 00:09:00

Comments: Hello AL, I have been with St.Michael Church in Goa for the past 16 years. Recently,Aids awareness campaigners came to me saying that I suggest "safe sex" to adolescents (condoms etc.)and remove the guilty feeling that comes with abortion.It has been a most tumultous period for me, virginity before marriage has become a joke in our country(thanks to the global outreach of american society) and is misinterpreted as repression of women, women have also left behind their nurturing role and therefore,young unattended children have taken to illicit sexual relations before marriage,alcohol etc.Women are being encouraged(by a handful of feminist women who are really powerful) to have successful careers,be "independent"and disregard marriage as one of the least important priorities in life.Unfortunately,many men are also agreeing to their point of view. Recently,I was also asked by a NGO working for Lesbian and Gay rights as to why the church is against them and why is their so much "hetro-sexism" in our society. I have prayed to the lord for strength yet I see the situation getting fast out of hand.Dear Al,this scenario is not peculiar to the christians of India, it has also done a great deal of harm to my Hindu,Muslim and Sikh brothers as our religions may be different but Indian Culture is common to all and is becoming too westernized,too soon.Dear son,I hope you will not take umbrage to my references on America-a few good men like you exist but religion has no hold on american society and since it is the most prosperous country(only economically) on earth,it's values(or lack of them) are reaching those places where people still respect their GOD.I hope American society comes full circle,it is the only hope for us as we are affected by demonstration effect India may not be rich but her family system is very very good and I hope can still be saved.¹¹⁵

Father Wilson,

It is clear that the feminist movement has targeted the church as its greatest enemy. The Christian Bible, and even Tradition, have made a water tight case against feminism. That is a fact which has not escaped feminists' notice. They have targeted the church with their heaviest weapons. From outside the church they attempt to use political propaganda to pressure the church to give up its truth in order to conform to

the political climate. They also use political pressure to make members feel as if they are out of step with society, and perhaps should leave such an archaic, and sexist organization. From the inside they even do more damage. They form groups to petition for change. They demand female priests and church officials. They want feminist heresy to become sacred doctrine. They even “retranslate” the Bible, distorting its original message from a patriarchal and anti-feminist one into a pro-feminist message. As they redraw the roads on the churches ancient “road map of life’s journey” they demonstrate their total disregard for Christianity. They are not Christian. They are not even tolerant of Christianity. They are openly hostile to traditional Christian beliefs.

And what does this say about the image of the church to the world, of which it is supposed to be the light? Groups, in support of homosexuality, sex outside of marriage, and the slaughter of innocent babies in the womb, openly approach the church with their blatant disgust of church doctrine, with expectation of changing the church’s stand on its truth. It is the world defining light for the church. Is this sane? I have watched most Christian denominations cave in to the feminists. They either are ordaining feminist pastors and priests, or they are seriously discussing doing so. With the Bible and Tradition both condemning feminism, it is clearly a collapse of the Christian church when it give feminists what they want.

I salute you in standing for what you believe to be true and not casting truth aside in order to appease the liberal hordes. They will never be satisfied. If they had all that they demanded today suddenly handed to them, they would be back tomorrow with new demands. The only thing to do is for supporters of traditional truth to stand firm, not stepping backwards an inch, and then moving forward to take back what has already been ceded the other side. If society is to survive, it must crush feminism, while uplifting women who are homemakers into a position of honor once again.

Feminists are tenacious and aggressive, but they are morally bankrupt and if strongly opposed their movement will collapse. That opposition is what my web page is focused on generating. I thank you for contributing your personal experience to that cause!

I wish you the best.

-Al-

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

Name: Josh

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: a planet swirling around in space

Time: 1999-03-12 00:27:00

Comments: Hello brother!!! I am sick of all this feminist crap,I do believe in equal rights for EVERYBODY not just females. I am glad to know that I am not the only man on this pathetic planet to realize men are seeing discrimination by these feminists. Men and women ARE different. Some things are only meant for a man things like WAR man, the average woman can't even protect herself from the average guy and women think they can go out and fight like TRUE warriors....I am young but not stupid. Is it just a coincidence that just about everything has been in the power of a man? Or is it the fact that women are not supposed to be the "dominate" ones? Look in the history books and on every part of the earth, men were the conquerers and inventors!!! I have more respect for the KKK than women who want to tear the entire race apart.....now, its time for a good game of RUGBY!!!)¹¹⁶

I don't have anything to add my friend. You have said it all. Thanks for your input!

-Al-

Name: Jai Kumar

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Chennai(INDIA)

Time: 1999-03-14 07:33:00

Comments: Dear Al, I seriously fail to understand what actually goaded some deranged peverts who initiated the feminist movement!! I'm a strong believer of natural laws.Laws immutable&laws infalliable,And I also believe that if they are tampered with, it leads to an unpleasant revolution.Nature since time immemorial has clearly demarcated roles for men and women ,it is only the perverse Dykes who felt that men's roles were superior. It is impossible to point a finger at any one entity who established Patriarchy and that makes it natural.Home makers are EQUALS of men not inferior to

them. As for women in the army, it is too absurd even to comment. For every job that a woman takes, a man loses a JOB--THIS MAY SEEM disgusting but it is TRUE. Women can remain homemakers (or career "persons") and readily find husbands where as house husbands find no spouse, MEN have no choice but to work, to support their spouses and children even in careers that they may ABHOR. In short, I see no logic in this Nauseating "movement"-which has given women long suffering from an "identity crisis", a negative popularity (if mothers don't have an identity, then I don't know who has "mother land". mother earth"-the list is endless) but at the cost of disintegrating society-which they are obviously blind to; let alone owning up to the responsibility for it. Ask yourself a question--ARE WE (MEN AND WOMEN) HAPPIER NOW, OR WERE WE HAPPIER IN THE PRE-FEMINIST ERA?¹¹⁷

Dear Jai,

There have always been the disgruntled lesbians who could never fit into normal society. Without a man they always appeared strange, and unnatural. Financially they were at a disadvantage because they added nothing of value to the next generation, society cared little about them or their wishes.

So what suddenly caused the feminist movement, the lesbian movement, to become mainstream? The twentieth century has been a tumult of change, inspired by those who did not fit in, who were not mainstream. If you look at Karl Marx, and those who worked with Lenin you find the same people (several of Lenin's cohorts had lived in New York City previously) with the same background who propelled the disruptive movements in the 1960s in the USA. They used the media to make it happen for their own purposes.

The United States in the 1950s was a mostly homogeneous nation, of people who believed that a woman should be in the home with the children. They disapproved of premarital sex and divorce. The society was solid and traditional. Then suddenly the disrupters moved in. They attacked all things traditional. They made anti-communistic efforts to appear evil, and the communists to appear as poor victims. They made the homogenous nature of the nation to appear "plastic" and useless. They made the homemaker to appear unfulfilled and useless, and the "career" woman to be important and far

above the family oriented housewife.

It came as a hammer blow. Suddenly the traditional point of view got little, or no press. When you heard any mention of traditional values in the news it was in a negative connotation. Suddenly television shows started popping up, like "That Girl" and "The Mary Tyler Moore Show" which featured career women, and you saw fewer shows like "Lassie", "Walton's Mountain," "Bewitched" and other shows featuring a stay at home mom. All drums of the media started beating the feminist cadence. Most women at first were disgusted with feminism. They thought the lesbian leaders were just incapable of getting a man, and laughed at them. But over time, when the media never showed the scorn that the feminists originally generated, women and men began to start taking the lesbian feminist movement seriously.

As you say, natural laws provide the foundation for Patriarchy. Insanity provides the foundation for feminism. It is only a matter of time before any society which allows its men to become so effeminate that they let women rule over them, will fall into oblivion. When the children are allowed to raise themselves, and to be taught their view of culture by the ones who own the media, as is happening today when children watch television, the culture in which these children were raised will die!

It is clear that women today are over worked and less happy than were the women of the past. What sort of insanity is it that drives women into the work place and then lays the entire burden of the home on her too? Yet that is what feminism has done! Look at almost any bachelor's apartment and you will see a messy, unkempt house. That is what happens when housework falls to a man. It doesn't get done. If he isn't going to do it for just one person, you can guess how much interest he is going to show in doing it for a house full of people. Women today still do the vast majority of the housework across America. They also do the vast majority of the child-rearing. They are doing the job of homemaker which is so much of a full time job that the saying is proverbial, "A mother's work is never done." They are also out there in the workplace trying to compete with men who are focused only on their workplace jobs. If that is not a formula for unhappiness for women, I don't know what is.

It is clear that feminism is a flawed and dangerous philosophy. I only hope that we come to our senses before our soci-

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

eties fall into the chaos that they are rushing to so quickly.

-Al-

Name: feminist

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 1999-03-18 11:17:00

Comments: feminists have never burned their bras. this is a fallacy created by the media. your an intelligent powerful man you should know everything. c'mon get your facts straight.¹¹⁸

Your ignorance is not something you should flaunt about so. Some feminists did burn their bras in public demonstrations. More importantly, many feminists began going around in public without wearing a bra, symbolically "burning" their bra. The fact is that women started going braless as a "statement" because of their agreement with the feminist movement. Nice try but if that is best you can come up with you must have a pretty weak case.

And to blame the media is hilarious. The very instrument which made the absurdity of feminism possible should not be blamed for promoting any negative images of feminism. That is like blaming Luther for opposing the Reformation, or his name sake for opposing civil rights. It just ain't so.

-Al-

Name: Gloria

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 1999-04-20 15:52:00

Comments: I don't know if I consider myself a feminist, but I do disagree whenever one group of people consider themselves superior to another. I realize that there are many differences between men and women, but we cannot resolve our differences and come to a peaceful arrangement if we do not first put everyone on the same level. "Feminists" and "Chauvinists" exist for one reason: they are unhappy with society's view on the roles of the sexes. I believe that if one group is unhappy with the current situation, we must begin

again and again until the human race is satisfied. I know this will not occur in our lifetime, but I am hopeful that someday the general populace will have established a society where no one group has exclusive power over another. I have lived long enough and seen enough pain to know that anger and hatred will never pass as a way of life. I know that my words might not change the opinions of those reading this, but I feel that I must state a new side to the argument. Thank you for your time.¹¹⁹

Gloria, Thanks for signing my guestbook. Society, as we know it, cannot function with everyone at the same level. It is not possible for everyone to be at the same level. The communists proclaimed, "equality for all," and yet even their iron-fisted attempt to force all humans down to the same mediocre level just did not work. You admit differences between the sexes. I insist that differences matter. The best a society can do for its people is to provide freedom. That means no affirmative action plans, which limits the freedom of an owner of a business to hire whomever he wishes to hire without the government getting in the way. That means that the government must not assist if a woman wants to enter the masculine world of men and compete with men in the workplace. She has no right to ask the government courts or legislature to change the workplace to suit her delicate disposition. If she can't tolerate the way the workplace is, she should have to leave just like a man would.

Where feminism has gone completely wrong is in their creating a totalitarian, communist-minded, attitude in our government. Instead of allowing society to shape itself according to the differences between the people, our dictatorial government now is trying to force all of us into the same PC mold. Of course it will never work. The harder they try the closer we approach the Soviet system of government, and we all know that was a failure.

You are wrong Gloria, as to why chauvinists and feminists exist. Chauvinists have always existed and always will exist because that is the way nature build the human animal, not because "they were unhappy with society's view on the roles of the sexes." Feminism exists because lesbians had no place in society and agitated to create discontent within our society with the natural way things were before. The only reason that the feminist movement was able to gain any

ground at all is because men, instead of being the ogres that feminists claim they are, were too soft and gave the women what they thought the women wanted. Now women and men are stuck with an unworkable situation, that only the lesbians are completely happy with.

Chauvinists existed before feminism was of any concern whatsoever. Chauvinism is the natural state that any society will mold itself into unless a concerted effort is made to do otherwise. Most men tend to be more aggressive than women. Most men tend to be more competitive than women are. Those are qualities which make men excel in business and government. Forty years of intense propaganda by the feminists has still not produced anything close to equality even in something as PC as the US Senate. You may want to move passed that as being insignificant but it is critical to my point. If feminism were natural, half of the Senate would be women right now. The only areas where women are even close to being equal in standing with men in the work place is where the government has propped them up, or quotas were instituted.

If, as you say, happiness is the criteria for structure of society we should immediately, without a moment's delay, dismantle feminism and return to the chivalrous chauvinist 1950s where women were happy homemakers and men were the heads of their households. These natural roles were far more satisfying to men and women and families were for more solid than they are today. Children were raised by their parents and not state operated day care centers. Mothers could spend time with their children which was gratifying to the mothers, and a necessary aspect to normal child development.

Yes, such a change would make the lesbians scream to high heaven as their twisted world is taken from them and there are other women who would not be happy about the change, but the vast majority of women and men would be far happier, and the number of kids who decide to go kill their classmates in school would be far smaller. Our society is crumbling to make the lesbians happy, and I oppose that. Perhaps you should too! -Al-

Name: Esuku

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfing On In

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

From:

Time: 1999-04-22 14:47:00

Comments: Who are you to judge your opposite sex like that?! I am a man, let that be known. I was brought up by men, and still have a good idea of women. I know that what you are telling me, in my eyes, is wrong, but I also realize that whatever I tell you will not change yours. I know that, it is simple to figure out. In fact, I do not know why I'm even doing this; perhaps I just want you to hear, from a man, that your mind has everything backwards. Women are not to be hated, they can be the sweetest thing you ever encountered. I find them trouble sometimes, but I can't live without them. After all, what is life worth if you can't enjoy it. Trust me, women are like us, except for the fact that they have breast and different sexual organs. I feel that I and doing my best friends a big favor for doing this, and I feel it is just right. May you find the right path, and come to your senses. Women are wonderful creatures. I just wanted you to hear it from a man. Thank you for your time, and don't go around saying this too loud. You might wind up getting your ass kicked. Thanks! - Esuku¹²⁰

Esuku,

It is a shame that you spent so little time visiting my page and actually seeing what was there before sounding off. As I have said on my page, women are not to be hated, and they are the sweetest things to ever be encountered. I have been married for nearly 23 years to the most wonderful woman in all of the world and I can't imagine living life without her, because she is my very best friend. So, you can tell me nothing about how wonderful women are.

I am so very glad that you are wrong. Women are not men with different plumbing. They are people who have different brains as well, and that is why they see the entire world differently than men do. It is why women will always be a mystery, a wonderful mystery, to men.

When you have to stoop to threats to make your point, you have already proven you have a worthless position which you are defending.-Al-

Name: Trina

Website:

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 1999-04-23 18:14:00

Comments: GO TO H__ YOU STUPID A__, SEXIST, HOMOPHOBIC FREAK!!¹²¹

Trina, I recommend that you pay a visit to the article Sticks and Stones where I discuss the fact that liberals, who have no facts to support their position, hide behind name calling to try and shut up the opposition. It appears that is the only tool you have in your toolkit. -Al-

Name: Paul Mc C

Website:

Referred by: Yahoo!

From: Scotland

Time: 1999-04-25 07:51:00

Comments: I think this is a great page! I am also very annoyed at the way society is going, thanks to feminist politically correct bulls____! I had a very hard time in school as the teachers saw fit to concentrate their attentions on the girls and practically ignore and even persecute the boys. I hate the way we see the masculination of todays young females. They think it is alright to play boys games and swear and curse as men do! This is repulsive! Also the way they try to dress as men do. It is so unnatural. Men are men and women are women. That is a biological fact that the PC fascist feminists cannot and will never change! Keep up the good work and help to save the futures of our sons and daughters!¹²²

Thanks Paul! I couldn't agree more. -Al-

Name: Iqbal Naeem

Website:

Referred by: Net Search

From:**Time:** 1999-04-26 00:36:00

Comments: Dear AI, I m originally from Pakistan but have visited your nice country many times. I m amazed at the "depth" of the unfairness of the laws which prevail in your country. How can it be

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

that a woman can marry a rich man (who may have inherited or made his money before marriage) later divorce him and walk away with a big chunk of his money? Isn't it some kind of theft or correct me if I m wrong. How can you equate forcible penetration of a husaband (which may be wrong and perhaps should come under the category of some kind of violence) to rape, which is traditionally a forceful penetration by a strange man and which does really cause much more physical and emotional scars. How can a woman get a man drunk and have sex with him without him being fully aware of what he is doing, and then fall pregnant against his wishes and then make him pay child support for a long time? How can unproven accusations of 19 years old girl secretary can bring her male boss"s entire reputation and career to its knees? Something needs to be done about all this. And his trend is spreading and becoming fashionable everywhere. I do not believe all women are evil. Most of them are not. But the truth is hidden behind political correctness. Please continue this important work. It seems Web is the only place where truth can be told openly in this manner.¹²³

Iqbal, you raise some very interesting questions. Unfortunately the web is the only place where this subject can be treated in a fair and open fashion. The leaders of the PC movement do all that they can in order to stop anyone from pointing out the flaws in their pet movements, including the feminist movement. You will find the same group of people who have blocked open discussion in the major news networks are behind many of the attempts to censure the internet, in the name of "saving the children." They produce software supposedly to filter out XXX material, but it also, as an aside, filters out "hate speech," which just happens to include open discussion of any topic that is not PC. You need not threaten violence or say horrible things about someone else to have your site censured as "hate speech." All you have to do is talk about what they don't want you to talk about.

America needs to wake up and realize that they have been taken over by people who do not care about traditional families or government. Instead the PC doctrine is enforced through the courts and the once free county is control like a bunch of sheep. -Al-

Name: Mark

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: England

Time: 1999-04-27 00:22:00

Comments: I have visited many similar sites on net and they all are mighty fine but how come we don't see any real results in real life? The male-bashing in the media continues. Anti-male laws continue to pass everywhere. I also note with regret that these sites do not attract as much traffic as some of the most useless sites. But something is better than nothing. I just hope all these sites will eventually Make a "real" difference in "real" lives of the men.¹²⁴

Mark,

When I first gained access to the Internet, I searched for antifeminist sites. I found none. So, I created the Chauvinist Corner. Now there are bunches of sites dealing with male issues. I don't know of too many that are as hard core traditionalist as mine but there are a few. It is getting better.

People often will not stand up and be heard unless they know others feel the same way that they do. I know that many Americans are sick and tired of how feminism has taken over the workplace and destroyed the American family in the process. My page is one point of agreement for those people. Here they can see that they do not stand alone in their disgust at the damage done by feminism.

Pass the word, we are coming back strong!

-Al-

Name: Arjun Ramphal

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: New Dehli

Time: 1999-04-28 00:01:00

Comments: Al Bro. I have learned something from your site and others similar to this one. I well and truly believe that a radical feminist is always a lesbian. Normal women simply can't hate men as much since nature has made men and women such that they cannot live without loving each others and feeling for each others. They may get angry with each others from time to time but constant and unconditional hate is not possible between them which is what the

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

radical feminism teaches. One cannot be a true blue modern radical feminist without being completely callous about men and that can only happen if the woman in question is a lesbian Regards...¹²⁵

Arjun,

The leaders of the feminist movement are mostly lesbian. They hate men and especially the power they perceive that men have. They lust after that power and position. It is all that drives them in life. They hate normal women who focus on children and family, and worst of all, men! A woman who dedicates her life towards making a man happy, and who actually relies on him for her entire support, just drives these lesbians crazy with rage. It is quite clear that lesbians hate the normal woman far more than they hate men, which takes some doing. The radical feminist is disgusted by the traditional woman.

Thank you for your insights! -Al-

Name: Sam

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Maryland, USA

Time: 1999-04-28 11:56:00

Comments: Al, Allow me to offer my congratulations on your excellent website. You have successfully mustered the courage to do what few of us have been able to do-- that is, come out publicly concerning the truth about men and women and their proper roles in society. It is pitiful that so many in our day and age among both men and women, have, through their docility, abandoned the wisdom of ages past and accepted the FEMINIZATION of society to the point where men and women are regarded as being interchangeable and qualities masculine are thought of as being nearly obsolete. I firmly believe that if women were to take the place of men and become leaders of society, within a relatively short period of time society would relapse into a primitive state, and become vulnerable to dangers from within and without. It is for this reason that people like you are held in admiration for forwarding the truth that it is men who have the intellectual capacity to break through new frontiers and push society forward, and are consequently better suited than women for public and religious life. A woman's primary duty, on

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

the other hand, is to the well-being of her family and graceful submission to her man. Nothing other than REASON and NATURE has established this state of things and we must hope REASON and NATURE will prevail once again In the meantime, keep up the good work and KEEP THE FAITH! (Why do I get the feeling I'm playing an old game?)¹²⁶

Sam,

Thanks for the kind words. They would not have to pass so many laws and create so many committees if feminism were natural and workable. As it is we are playing a stupid game, that can only end badly for all concerned. It is an old game, for feminism has reared its ugly head many times over the course of history, only to fall dead of its own useless weight. It will do so again, rest assured. -Al-

Name: Robert Shaw

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Somewhere in the land of captives and cowards

Time: 1999-05-01 09:25:00

Comments: Hello there Do you know what these terms are 1)dss 2)nvr3 3)fras 4)bhs ? Well I will tell you. dss = divorce settlement syndrome in which a husband who loses everything which he worked for so long gets so frustrated and depressed that he kills his wife. nvr3 = no visitation rights syndrome in which a husband is denied meetings with his own children by mothers or courts on false complains and husband kills his wife fras = false rape accusation syndrome in which an innocent man whose whole life is shattered by false accusation of a rape by a woman, kills that woman. bha = come on you should be able to guess that: battered husband syndrome for which I offer no explanation.

Al, do u think these syndromes will ever be recognized or accepted? Well, I don't hold my breath but hey its possible.¹²⁷

Robert,

I don't think that we will find any sympathy from the feminists for any of the syndromes you mentioned. A "fair" feminist divorce settlement is for all of the property, the custody of the children and every penny that the man makes for the

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

rest of his life to go to the poor female who had to put up with such an animal as a male. We are told that a woman must be believed if ever she claims a man (unless she is accusing Bill Clinton!) attacked her, and of course the sweet female sex never would batter her spouse. Since the offended party in all cases is the female, by definition there is no hope of a court recognizing any of your syndromes. The twinkly defense maybe, but never 1)dss 2)nvr3)fras 4)bhs!

-Al-

Name: Darren Ferr

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: London

Time: 1999-05-03 13:40:00

Comments: Though I do not completely agree with everything you say and sometimes do find your opinions rather extreme THAT'S OK. If women can make extreme statements than it is ok for men to do so as well. Also, what is this wife business that you brag about? Do you try to make other men jealous? (Kidding) On that note, does your wife have an unmarried sister who is like her? (he he)If she does I don't think she is still unmarried. Kind regards to you, sir, on the excellent website.¹²⁸

Darren,

You must not judge all appearances of extremism merely by the surroundings within which they are placed. The average male or female of a century ago would be classified as a wild and fanatical sexist by today's standards. That does not make them extreme, however. I choose to view those wise men and women as rational and correct, and that sets the views of today into a clear and bright light, showing them to be the true extreme and fanatical ideas. Our society has embraced insanity and therefore sanity appears to be mad.

I consider myself the luckiest man of all time, for I have a wife, who could walk in the company of the gods and make them jealous. We are closing fast on our 23rd wedding anniversary and it is as sweet, nay sweeter by far, than it was when we began, and it seemed perfection even then!

My wife's last unmarried sister appears to be on the way to the altar. Disappointing I know.

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

I thank you for your very kind words concerning my web page! I hope that it provides a place where those who know better, but can't find others to agree with them, can see that all of the world has not yet looked into the eye of the Medusa of feminism, and been turned into unthinking stone.

I wish you well my friend!

-Al-

Name: A Veteran's Wife

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Pennsylvania

Time: 1999-05-14 13:32:00

Comments: Dear Al, Were you even remotely aware that applying this critical topic in order to teach yourself html would result in the finest web site on the net? Call it "female intuition" or whatever, I believe you're for-real.

May not know much, but I know this: Patriarchy values women far more than some quasi-Marxist-state ever will or care to; and it's a darn shame that the evidence of this TRUTH is all too seldom available to the majority--who are about maxed out just trying to make ends meet, while being taxed up the... for programs that just plain don't (and won't) work.

I'm also delighted to be learning that (father-headed)family-concerned people are no longer keeping silent, but are making their views, their (careful) research known.

Thank you for posting your web site.

May God, the Heavenly FATHER, bless you and yours.

Susan B.

p.s. Unlike men, who HAD to fight in Vietnam, women have been spared the experience of dodging bullets while wearing the same wet and gruddy clothes for WEEKS on end.¹²⁹

Thank you Susan! I appreciate the kind words, and also for your thoughtful insights. If more people would look at the big picture they would realize that feminism and Marxism talk a good game but play like a scratched record. Feminists do not care whether women are happy or not. Feminists couldn't care less if women are put in harm's way. Having women put into military uniform does not improve the mili-

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

tary, it weakens it. Having women drafted into the military, which is the logical next step for the feminists, will force our young women into situations where they will be blown to pieces, captured and repeatedly raped, while all the while they will hold their fighting units back. No supporter of Patriarchy would dream of such an outrage. Western civilization has always protected the women and children, for that is the future of the society. Feminists are at war with mothers and children, and therefore they are at war with the future of our civilization. What could be more of a sign of value placed upon a woman, than when a man says, "I will die in war that you might live"? Conversely, what could more clearly show the disdain that feminists have for women, and their welfare, than that they want to make women cannon fodder?

Thanks again for your kind assessment of my page. -Al-

Name: Mohammed Ahsen

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Miami

Time: 1999-05-16 09:25:00

Comments: I think you may be a genius. It is very difficult to think independently in this manner and see the truth when the whole west, nay, the whole world has embarked blindly upon political correctness. I can fully understand if your views are unpopular. The absolute "truths" of today's radical feminism would have been too, a century ago. But just because your views are unpopular doesn't mean they are wrong. At least in my opinion they are not. Will say again you may be a genius. No flattery intended.¹³⁰

I thank you for the generous evaluation you have made of my mental capabilities. My only real claim is that I understand that which worked in the past was better than that which is not working today. For too long in the West we have assumed that which is newer is automatically better. *Tradition* is cast aside, to make room for *guesswork*. While *Tried and true* is laughed at and ridiculed, *trial and error* is applauded and followed. As our families fall apart and our children turn to shooting their classmates, it is perfectly clear that the abandonment of our traditional family and sexual roles has been at the heart of many of our most serious problems.

-Al-

Name: pratap Singh

Website:

Referred by: Yahoo!

From: Kashmir (INDIA)

Time: 1999-05-17 05:06:00

Comments: Dear Al, I totally agree with you on everything(except a few things) however, we are fighting a battle that we shall never win. I have absolutely no hope for the male of the species. People in the west might regard India as a man's world, but believe you me-it's not. Do you know that one soldier (man) dies in Siachen Glacier everyday?-that's where I disagree with you on the point of women joining the army - they should die just as men have to. Women contend that cooking and cleaning in the household are done by women --is that torture or is compulsory conscription torture?

It is a known fact that men die sooner than women, then why do men and women have to contribute equally to the pensions? Why does custody of children invariably go to women, the only thing a man cannot do is breast feed his children (and millions of women don't even do that to maintain their figures!). YOU call a policeman a police "officer", yet all the dirty jobs are done by police men. As for domestic violence, many, many men are also victims- yet they have nowhere to go-"take it like a man"-this is the way they are socialized - also, there is no National Council For men.

What does a man do in these circumstances ,marry a house wife (who will be a parasite as in India domestic help is quite affordable, even for middle class families) and risk losing half his hard earned money in alimony-or marry a "career woman" and leave the children with an Aaya (Nanny). The concept of "quality time" is anyway grotesque-(as the recent shoot out in Colorado might indicate) and to answer the Feminist question -Why can't the man leave his job?-it's because society still considers a house wife-nee,homemaker a respectable means of making a living, but not a "house husband."

Al, do you know in India a man can actually be convicted of committing adultery, and not a woman? Homosexuality is punishable with ten years in jail, but lesbianism is not even recognized ("no penetration") and therefore, not punishable. Laws are made for women and they have and will continue to exploit them in their fa-

your.

I'm a pretty good looking man (at the cost of blowing my own trumpet!) but marriage these days is too risk prone for men and therefore, I have decided against it. Don't misunderstand me AL, I'm not a misogynist, I love my mother, But today's women (and I don't put the blame entirely on them -it's considered to be shameful not to have your own "identity-i.e don't change your surname") are not marriageable

. Well, Al that's about it we are loosing a battle that should never have started - (it was a man's world because men made it -science, architecture, religion, medicine, poetry, literature, any field, you name it).The only way we (Man kind, not "Human Kind") can cope is by treating them as equals--Let there be forced conscription for women as well(thats equal),let the police "officers" (women) do an equal share of the dirty work (that's equal")-let the number of occupational deaths be equally divided amongst men and women, Let women also support their husbands and children finincially (that's equal).My point is when they are truly treated as equals they will start toeing the line once again and realize that men's lives are much tougher and they are better (and safer) off in the kitchen.¹³¹

Pratap,

I can see that you are very frustrated by the feminist movement. It may surprise you to hear that there are a great many women who are also frustrated by it. Many women would love to have the security of a home, with a faithful husband to provide for her, where she could raise the children safely. Deep inside most women there is a very powerful maternal instinct, and they have to fight that instinct in order to practice feminism. (Feminism is completely unnatural for a normal, non-lesbian woman.) A normal mother wants to be there to raise her child. Also the normal woman is not bent on rulership. She wants respect, and she wants her opinions considered, but she has no problem with a man leading a family if it is does it right. Patriarchy is so completely natural to both men and women, it is amazing that we have allowed ourselves to be talked out of it in favor of a makeshift, tinker-toy constructed idea like feminism.

You raised a great number of important issues! You must take heart though. As time goes on, one of two things will happen: either the feminists will get their wish, and all wom-

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

en will be forced to face death in war, just like men do, and nearly all women will end up as single mothers, and life will become unbearable for all the normal women forcing them to rebel and demand a return to Patriarchy; OR men will wake up, push the lesbians out of the way, and take charge like they should have been doing all along. Problem solved.

The one thing that women need to understand is this: they should fear feminists a thousand times more than they do the male chauvinist. The male chauvinist will never send them into battle, rip their children from their arms -- to put them into a state run daycare center -- or break up their families. Feminists do those things every day!

-Al-

Name: Mark Butcher

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Australia

Time: 1999-05-17 05:18:00

Comments: Al, what's the point of having web sites? You are never going to achieve anything. Patriarchy is over -- we went without even giving a fight (how can men fight the "oppressed sex"?). Al, we're the last generation of real men -- see the school books the little ones read these days ("Pol. Correct") and you will know what I mean. Young boys are being turned into wimps.

Either we be quiet or we fight the dykes! -- What say?¹³²

Mark,

I'm with you mate! Let's fight the dykes! Don't think for a minute that women aren't out there watching the men and wondering what is wrong with them, getting walked all over by women. A warrior never finds difficulty locating a mate. It is the wimp, the liberal feminist-minded male who is never really respected or trusted by women. It is an unnatural condition for a man and women know it. For thousands of generations women have had their hearts won by the masculine male who takes charge. They don't want an abusive male but they would love a strong one.

The schools have a number of issues that we are going to have to deal with. One of them is the feminist propaganda being put out. They can tell a boy all day that the bouncing,

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

giggling girl sitting next to him in class is the same as he is but he knows better. So, does she, believe me.

More important, even than the schools, is the government. As long as the government allows sexual harassment suits, and discrimination suits, there will be no solution to this problem. The government is forcing egalitarian feminism upon us all as a state religion, with torturous penalties for the heretic. That is where the real enemy is. Remove the government yoke from off of our necks and feminism would be gone in very short order.

-Al-

Name: Paul Sideways

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Salford UK

Time: 1999-05-17 08:06:00

Comments: Al, this is basically in response to some of your guest book entries which suggest men should give up trying for their rights. I believe we should never give up. And we do a "REAL" chance of winning equality again. All we need is for men to come out of a certain "gentlemanly" frame of mind. This must first happen in West (USA) because every successful trend nowadays first starts in USA and is then aped by the rest of the world. The alimony laws that one of our Indian brothers has referred to were not present in India few years ago. But they have been aped by Indian government which like most "modern" "democratic" governments of the worlds is starting to ape West/USA. So far feminism owes its spectacular success to softness on men's part. Men let women have their way. Especially in West and it sort of becomes a value system for the rest of the world to follow. Al, you will be surprised to know (if you don't already) what a powerful country USA is. And I m not talking about financial and military strength. I m talking about influence you folks have on the rest of the world. And when an average man in the USA gets angry about injustices and also shakes off his "gentlemanly" mentality and fights for his rights things will start to happen and rest of the world's men will follow the suit.¹³³

Paul, you are absolutely right. In the USA we have a lot of work to do. We have turned our government over to others

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

and stopped thinking for ourselves. We have fallen into the trap of "niceness." We are accepting the ridiculous because it sounds "fair." The fact is that "fairness" often isn't. Being fair can cause more problems than anything else.

In the name of fairness America has destroyed our homes, our schools and many of our neighborhoods. We have forced our tax burden up to the point where families have to really sacrifice in order to keep the mother in the home for the children. I do not want equality between men and women. It is an absurdity to expect equality between such different things. I instead want the best for both sexes! I want men to have a life where they are happy. I want women to have a life where they are happy. I want men to have the advantage in the workplace because that is where they will NATURALLY thrive and be the most productive. I want women to have the advantage in the home and neighborhood, the opportunity to be with the children and to create a home for their families because that is where they will NATURALLY thrive and be the most productive. I want a return of the masculine and the feminine into our society. Not equality but complementation. The male and the female, different but both superior in their own sphere.

As it was, so shall it be. -Al-

Name: Shubojit Mukhopadhyaya

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Calcutta, India.

Time: 1999-05-22 10:15:00

Comments: Dear Al, you are getting a lot of letters from India, I'm not surprised. The feminist movement has hit us really hard. You know, one solution to the problem could be that men and women, or "womyn" actually have equal rights and be treated equally by society, unfortunately, the life of men continues to be much harder. Not only have the feminists changed all the laws that were unfair to women they have made laws unfair for men, and the laws that were traditionally against men have been allowed to remain so. There are only men in active combat in the Indian army (women are in the technical field), yet whenever the army fights off insurgency in Kashmir or elsewhere, the press thanks "the men and women" of the Indian army." A few questions need to be asked; Why must women

always get custody of the children - even though men do at least as much for the children if not more? Why must the man always have to pay alimony?(even when the wife is divorced on grounds of adultery-the unlucky few who get caught, that is) for men to get alimony under Indian law, the man must prove that he is physically or mentally incapable of earning a living-no such requirements for women. You marry a woman, if it doesn't last, she leaves, leaving the man penniless and childless. Under Indian Penal Code(IPC)there is a section called 498-A: it is for prohibition of harassment for Dowry. Under this provision, the woman can, on a mere complaint to the police, get her Husband and In-laws arrested. The "offense" is non-bailable and the Mother-in -Law will eventually be let off, as there is a "sympathy" clause for women, but the husband and father-in-law will rot in jail for at least 6 months. This law is abused rampantly everyday, yet the Government is a silent spectator. There are a million organizations which an "abused or battered" wife can approach for help, but none exist for abused men ("don't be silly, men are not abused by their wives"). Do you know AI, that men can actually be CONVICTED in a court of law for adultery, and not women ("what, Indian women and commit adultery, you must be joking"). A woman can choose to live separately without divorcing and still claim "maintenance" for herself and "her" children. Men cannot inherit the property of their wives ("otherwise men will kill their wives for the property"), whereas women can. It is an often repeated statistic that a woman is raped in India every two minutes, the fact that 2 men are murdered every 2 minutes, is of course, unimportant; more and more children are taking to drugs, sex etc. at a very early age (and in a conservative culture like ours, it is all the more disturbing) because motherhood, sorry, "parenthood" is now all about "quality time."; women can be sexually harassed (i.e. it is recognized under law), whereas men (unlike in western countries) cannot. There is reservation in medical colleges for women in south India (Tamil Nadu) and in village Panchayats (village Parliaments/Legislatures); they are also proposing a "women's reservation bill"-33%reservation of seats in Lok sabha (National Parliament for women), if you can't win elections on your own, how are you equal? Schools must now spend an equal amount of money on "women sportspersons" even though they are not as good as men and no one, not even the girls themselves come to watch them; the school books

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

are also being made "gender indifferent", ("As all the Freedom fighters, war heroes, poets, writers, scientists etc. are men and therefore, young girls are made to feel inferior from an early age");there are "free ladies nights", but no free "Lads" nights in pubs, Bars, Nightclubs etc., and "stag" entry is not allowed; men STILL have to pay for their dates; I could go on and on, the list is endless, however what is most shocking is that the Feminists are still not satisfied and the movement has only intensified further. The problem Al, is two fold; 1:Please don't take offense, but it is your sick country that is responsible for all this crap(though real men like you still exist, and that is heartening to know). 2:Second,most Men have become wimps and cannot come out of their Chivalrous mindset. The women have been and still are taking advantage and worst of all, they are still complaining. We are on are way down, let's face it. The feminist bitches are taking over a world that MEN made with their superior brains and hard work.¹³⁴

Dear Shubojit,

I am outraged by the feminist laws in the USA but it appears that feminism has mutated to an even more absurd creature in India than it has in my country. As far as who is to blame for feminism, in the movie, Star Wars, Obie Wan Kanobie said, "Who is worse, the fool or he who follows the fool?" Unfortunately, we are all to blame for not standing up to feminism at its first appearance and at every step it has taken since.

I think chivalry is good. I think women should be treated differently than men. (e.g. For a woman to commit adultery, unlike a man, she is usually after a relationship, rather than just sex, I think that female adultery is even more of an infidelity to a marriage and should be punished at least as strongly if not more strongly than for a man.) The feminist claims that they do not want women treated differently. They want women to be just the same as men. Then they push for all sorts of special treatment for women, calling it "equality." What a joke. And the joke's on us.

The only question is, when will men revolt? When will they finally reach the point of having had enough of this absurd abuse and take their rightful places once again? I hope it is soon!

-Al-

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

Name: Melinda

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: New Zealand

Time: 1999-05-22 10:22:00

Comments: You have a lot of sympathy for men. Just for your information, I was ditched by my boyfriend (he refused to marry me) because he felt housewives are parasites. The fact that I would keep a wonderful home and be a wonderful mother just did not appeal to him.

Now, why don't you get your house in order first?¹³⁵

Melinda,

I am sorry that you think that I do not have just as much sympathy for women as men on this issue. You are wrong! When I started this page, I chose the subject because of my wife and the pain she has suffered from thoughtless fools who have made cutting remarks about how great she is as a homemaker. The "career" woman is not satisfied with merely abandoning her own family but she must try to shame others into doing the same. My web page is an effort to point out the absurdity of these thoughtless people and to highlight the real value of the glorious treasure that a good homemaker, like my wife, truly is!

Alas, men can be just as gullible as women. Boys are taught in school the same stupid nonsense that the girls are. Many boys grow up believing the absurd feminist lies just like the girls do. Your ex-boyfriend is a brainwashed fool. As painful as it is, you are better off without him. Real men are harder to find today than they used to be, but they are still out there! I hear from men all the time who would love to have a woman who is just like you.

My house is in order. I have been married for 22 years (almost 23) and my wife has been a stay at home wife with our kids. I have supported her financially, emotionally and every way that I could. I am very proud of my wife and I consider my marriage the most important part of my life.

What we need to do is to join in a common attack upon the source of your problem: feminism! America, and all of the countries who follow her lead, will never get her house in order as long as feminism is the official state religion. We

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

have to shut down the propaganda mill in school which teaches boys and girls that our wonderful wives and mothers are parasites. Homemakers are just the opposite of parasites! Homemakers are the most giving and important of all creatures on earth. No home should be without one. In fact no real home **can** be without one!

-Al-

Name: Vikram Singh

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfing On In

From: India

Time: 1999-05-27 20:51:00

Comments: Dear Al,

Hi It's me again. If you read up on newspapers regularly you would already know that India and Pakistan are on the brink of yet another war(two Indian Air Force planes were shot down by Pakistan today).As expected, the Indian Dykes are keeping mum. The men have to fight for their country and have to face death, while their wives are *unfaithful* back home and will receive handsome pensions after their husbands die.¹³⁶

Men have always given their lives to protect their women and children. The saddest part of it today is that it is not even appreciated anymore. While men are on the frontlines, the females are at the rear. The men are dying but the news talks about the "men and women" of the armed services as if they were all doing the same job. Something's got to give. -Al-

Name: Jim Wong

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfing On In

From: Los Angeles USA

Time: 1999-05-30 21:53:00

Comments: My dear brother Al, You don't know what a great place your site is for today's mostly unhappy men. Don't you dare close this site or I will personally come after you (Just kidding).

On more serious note, I have noticed few sites being shut down, but I think that is to be expected. I have also noted with some unease that you haven't updated since last November. Why? Please

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

also consider having a "forum" of some kind where men can regularly post their thoughts.

It is surprising how many men still don't take feminism seriously. The other day, I posted something on manhood online and was met with callousness and in fact opposition. I think most men out there have come to terms with feminism. In the end I thank you my friend and brother for providing this much needed site. May God bless you.¹³⁷

Jim,

Thanks for sharing your thoughts, and of course for your kind words. I have no intention of closing this page down. If AOL for some reason should deny me access to this URL I will merely move my page to a new location, but I will never take it down completely. You see, in reality it is a page which I created for my wonderful wife and therefore it is her page, and as long as I live I will never take her page down. Feminists have made my wife's life harder because she loves her family and has dedicated her life to making her family as happy as can be. She is the most wonderful girl I have ever known. After all that unselfish dedication, she has had to listen to the feminist jerks call her names and say things about her that not only are untrue but that are also very hurtful. This page is my defense of my wife for her wonderful giving spirit and beautiful nature that I, and our children have been lucky enough to be beneficiaries of.

I reached a point where my web page felt "complete." Of course no page is ever really complete, but I had covered most issues that I felt I needed to. I have moved on to another web page on another issue that I feel strongly about and have devoted my energies to that for the last year or so. (So much to write about, so little time.)

I think, at least for the time being, this guest book will have to do for a forum. I just don't have the time right now to moderate a forum.

Thanks again! -Al-

Name: Gavin Larsen

Website:

Referred by: From a Friend

From: New Zealand (I am Currently in Hardwar,India.)

Time: 1999-06-01 03:28:00

Comments: Dear Al, Don't worry (and this goes out to all men), women cannot ever rule the world. Let me tell you the story of a donkey (you can read feminist) that once challenged a LION(man). Said the donkey, "You are not the lord of the forest. I am. And if you don't believe it, we can have a fight and prove it. The Lion simply disappeared into the forest (like men have learned to live with the women libbers). A fox was watching; she could not believe what had happened. She went to the lion and asked, "What is the matter?" He said, "Have you gone crazy? If I fight with the donkey, and she is defeated, she loses nothing. But Donkeys are donkeys; If I am defeated, I have something to lose. She has nothing to lose; she can challenge."

Inferiors are always angry and ready to fight. The more you achieve (men), the more superior you become, the softer you become. Down throughout history you can watch it happening, the same drama again and again. Anger remains in poor/inferior people/races/sexes. Hence, all revolutionaries depend on anger, superior people are never angry and thus, they are not interested in fighting, when you have nothing to lose (like feminists), you fight. Why not fight? Either you gain something, or you don't lose anything. In every way you gain something (like attention, feminists live on that, that is why you have so many letters from sick feminists using all kinds of unprintable cussing).

For the past three to four decades, feminists have been denying that men are superior. I feel that this is totally foolish, are they mad? If men are not superior, why are you so worried? Be finished with this topic, militant feminists have wasted their whole lives (apart from changing laws, for biology cannot be changed). Such intensity is idiotic-one thing is certain-that deep in the unconscious they (feminists) are still seeking, and they are not satisfied, otherwise they would have enjoyed, lived their lives; satisfaction can come only out of a yes, a tremendous positivity. If we join hands and counter attack, I think we will also be acting like donkeys, ignore the feminists, that is their worst punishment.¹³⁸

Gavin,

I try and get the unprintable cussing left by the feminists out of my guest book as quickly as possible. It is certainly

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

true that the feminists are frustrated and very negative. They seem quite unhappy don't they?

All that you say about feminists is true. You might be surprised to hear me say this, but the only real problem is not feminism. The real problem is the government, and those who control it. They have decided that the superior must be forced to be inferior. They have decided that the natural is unnatural and the normal is not. And in their deciding they have also chosen to enforce their twisted views upon us all. Of course it will not change biology but it can very easily destroy this country and many other countries who follow our lead. While we may not have to join hands to beat a "bunch of women", we will have to join hands to defeat tyranny! Come let us fight tyranny together!

-Al-

Name: Lise

Website:

Referred by: From a Friend

From:

Time: 1999-06-10 08:25:00

Comments: I agree with very little on your webpage, but I won't address those issues here. I would like to point out something. Yes, I enjoy being a sexual person. Sex is power. I enjoy being admired. But I am not just a sex object. Women are much more than that. We are not Barbie Dolls. We can look like them at times; we, however, think, have opinions, don't need a man to determine our worth. This is something you should have included. Unless your experience as a GI Joe has left you wondering what is left after plastic.¹³⁹

Lise, As my wife and I are celebrating our 23rd wedding anniversary, I have to chuckle at the feminists who never agree with the answers on my page, but have no answers themselves. What they want to do is to continue to allow our families to disintegrate in order for their petty little political agenda items to continue to be forced upon others.

I never owned a GI Joe, they came along shortly after my boyhood days. There was nothing plastic about my tours of duty as a member of the US Navy or the wonderful woman who, as my wife, shared those years with me. So, your concerns are misplaced.

I find it interesting that you list "power" as your primary Reason for wanting to be sexually admired. Power over Whom? Men of course. (I know the NOW gals are trying to use their sexual power over each other but they are pretty twisted.) That is the traditional way of human existence. The sexual part of a marriage is something which covers minor irritations. It is a joining of the soul of a man and woman in love. It is deeper than mere attractiveness. While it is a strengthening agent for marriage, feminists wish to use sexual attractiveness as "power" in the workplace, in government and other inappropriate places. Leading a man on, teasing him with the thought of potential sexual favors, is dishonest, or even worse if not dishonest, contributing to the destruction of his family. Sexuality is either going to be a positive, marriage enhancing part of a woman's life or it is going to be perverted into a plaything where women are truly nothing but sex objects, prostitutes for business, and political advantage. The feminists are pushing hard for the latter. Is it any wonder that they have called wives, "prostitutes"? That piece of deceit, in their minds, makes what they are doing seem less repulsive.

At no place on my page did you find any statement that women are only sex objects. In fact it is a clear indication that you missed most of my page to even suggest it. The fact is that women are sex objects and want to be. Take a walk along any beach or visit any swimming pool to see that it is so. Feminists say that women are not sex objects and do not want to be considered such. They are liars and I merely pointed it out. Of course that is not all that women are, but it is a part of the package which feminists are afraid of. In Women, the Foundation of Civilization I show how women are a great deal more than merely being sex objects.

Women have a great many natural abilities and critical talents, which are put to extremely important use in the role of homemaker. As a wife and mother, she manages the household, administers the social calendar and supplies the nurturing and crucial instruction that the children need as they grow and mature. No simpleton could possibly do that job well. It is a shame that feminists have promoted the lie so effectively, that women who are homemakers are less than women who have a career outside of the home. The fact is that no one, man or woman, is as important as the homemaker-mother who will raise the next generation for our nation. -

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

Al-

Name: Veteran's wife

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Pennsylvania

Time: 1999-06-11 13:13:00

Comments: Dear Al, After reading your response to Jim's letter, (#73) whew! You must be one busy man. Just want to say, again, thank you for--not only having the best site--but making available, for all to read, the most interesting, intelligent guestbook on the net. More of that "intuition" stuff, again. Can't help but have the feeling, that real men (and real women) are coming away from your site with a (permanently) renewed sense of courage; and so, are better armed in defending themselves, their marriages, their nation's sovereignty, against the femu-leeches, who push for namby-pamby laws, which effectively suck the lifeblood from our constitution--by needlessly endangering our troops, (in a conflict which is not really America's problem) while compromising our military's readiness, setting citizen against citizen and imposing unlawful searches of private property. If such is not an alternative strategy used in the War on Democracy, (on Men) then what is! Down the road a ways, if your (purpose and hope evoking) site turns out to be among the front-line tanks that stormed the gates of Gorgons' Gulag; and so, enabled the prisoners, still languishing within, to free themselves... In years from now, remembering how demented policies over the last decades of the 20th century were being restored back to (natural) reason, tomorrow's history will not surprise a certain old woman in the 21st century. Once again, thank you, thank you, thank you for helping people (including myself) in getting the heck out, and away from, that terribl(y obnoxious)e place.¹⁴⁰

Susan B.

Susan, allow me to thank you for your kind assessment of the value of my web page and guestbook, and also for your intelligent and insightful commentary on what the feminists are doing to our nation. As the feminists are centered completely upon themselves, caring not a whit for the harm that they are doing to the society in which they live, or for the de-

struction of millions of women's lives (not to mention the lives of the men whom feminists REALLY couldn't care less about), the traditional American is left with nothing but frustration and anger at having their wonderful society forcibly taken from them. These traditionalist men and women are not focused merely on themselves. Instead, they are focused upon society, the family and other external essentials, which in the long run are the best and only guarantee of personal safety and freedom of action.

It makes the work that I have put into the Chauvinist Corner seem all worthwhile when I read posts like yours. I thank you. Your husband is a very lucky man! -Al-

Name: Naeem Iqbal

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfing On In

From:

Time: 1999-06-12 06:16:00

Comments: Hi Al bro, this is me again. How come you have deleted all the previous letters? Only last 10 are available. Come on, disk space is not that expensive. And if it is then please consider making your main page less graphic to save it. The reason I m insisting so much on having a complete (or at least reasonably complete) guest book is that it contains many points of view. And visitors to your page can understand how others feel and think about what you are presenting (which is by and large positive responses) Otherwise its just you telling whatever you think. Please, its just a suggestion. And I know its easy to sit on one's bum and make suggestions which may not be practical for others. You remain someone I admire.¹⁴¹

Naeem my friend, I have not deleted any guestbook entries from my web page since it started, except obscene or repetitive (or both) entries. (The guestbook is provided by Guest World and is not even contained in my disk space.) If you go to the bottom of the page you will find a box where there are two buttons displayed: "Next 10 Guests" and "Previous 10 Guests". If you click on "Next 10 Guests" you will see the next 10 entries. Also in that same box is shown which entries are being displayed currently: "Current Record Range -- Displayed is 77 to 68." There is also a window which allows you to enter a particular record number and you can go

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

directly to that entry. If you want to read the entire guestbook in order you could put a one (1) in that window and go to the first entry, and as you reach the top of each page you would then hit "Previous 10 Guests" and it would take you to the next page.

A while back I did take the guestbook down for a while, (without deleting any entries) as I was creating my other web page and the guestbook was becoming a lot of extra work. But I decided to put it back up because I agree with you: it is good to let the feminists make fools of themselves in public by putting their opinions in black and white. The reason that I respond to them in my guestbook is because the feminists have had an unanswered monopoly on the news media for well over thirty years in the USA and I have listened to their lies and angry male-hating diatribes for the last time without speaking back. Now they will have to listen to some common sense for a change, painful as it is for them.

Thanks for the concern about my guestbook. I am sure there are other visitors who have the same question about it. - Al-

Name: Karen

Website:

Referred by: From a Web Ring

From: Oklahoma

Time: 1999-06-27 22:49:00

Comments: Hello Al....you have a great web site. Hope it stays here for a long time to come. I agree with 99% of what you say. With the exception of women not voting or being involved in politics. I am actively involved in politics in Oklahoma. Was in office at the County level from 1995-1998. Am running for another office next year. My husband and I have been married 27 years. We have successfully raised 3 children2 girls and 1 boy. We are conservatives in our belief. One of the things I tell people is that the most important job I have done in life was be a Mother. It is an honorable and sometimes very hard job....especially when you are trying to do your best for them. My husband and I have always done for our family what we thought best....not what any so called "experts" thought...and not afraid to use and enforce the rules in the Bible. The feminists have deceived many but not everyone. I still believe there is hope for America. They may have won the battle but not the

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

war. One thing people do not do is study the issues enough...if they did it would open a lot of eyes. As far as women in office is concerned, its not for everyone....no more than it is for every man to serve. It is a brutal battlefield, but much of life is anymore no matter who you are. It takes thick skin and one had better know what they believe. I did not enter politics until my children were grown. I have no regret nor does my husband about it. When I had children at home however, I would not have considered it. They were first priority. My husband was in the Navy and gone most of the time they were growing up. None of them produced children out of wedlock or became involved in crime or drugs. We consider that very successful in this day and age. When I was in office, there were times my constituents came to talk to me. Most of them, of both sexes were very nice to deal with. Some, of both sexes were very emotional. They would try to intimidate and/or threaten me. It never worked. Women were just as guilty as the men. Anyway, just wanted to say hi and keep up the good work.¹⁴²

Karen,thank you for taking the time to sign my guest book and for your kind words. I applaud your work on raising the next generation! My wife was a Navy wife for many years and I know the hard job that is.

It is nice that we can disagree on the issue of politics and still remain friends. I was not so fortunate with the Ringmaster of the Ring of Conservative Sites. She saw my views on feminism and politics (Banning the 19th Amendment, Cruella De Ville)and dropped me off the ring. (My number of hits has gone up since then so it didn't do my site any harm.) The feminist point of view, even the conservative feminist, is completely antagonistic to the societal arrangement which our forefathers created and bled for. Even though we may disagree on one important issue, it is always good hear support for the homemaker. Thanks! -Al-

Name: Paul

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Australia

Time: 1999-07-01 07:23:00

Comments: Hi Al, Please also include an article on "Feminist Cen-

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

sorship" in your site. I believe it is a very important topic. Feminists go to extreme lengths to censor (hide) truths which may go against them. I wasn't fully aware of this phenomenon until I read the article at David Throop's site ([The Men's Issues Page](#)). I have also experienced it first hand recently when a site called "Manhood Online" was dropped. It was up and running for months until guys kept talking about things like masturbation, and hugging each other. But as soon as they seriously started discussing issues which affect them the site was suddenly shut down. I DO believe that was no coincidence. So please an informative article on this is necessary. many thanks¹⁴³

Paul - You can rest assured the powers that be will do all that they can to stamp out opposition to their cause. Where possible they will be happy to silence the opposition. However, if a page is removed from one ISP it will merely pop back up on another one. It is fortunate that our ability to produce new sites is currently greater than their ability to shut them down. I am happy to point out that [Manhood Online](#) still exists! -Al-

Name: lise

Website: Not mine, but a worthwhile site on abortion issues

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 1999-07-03 09:57:00

Comments: I haven't read most of your site yet, so I don't feel like I'm in a position to comment on it yet. Suffice it to say, I believe in equality, NOT superiority of EITHER sex. If a woman WANTS to have a traditional role, then that's fine to me. But some women are happiest in and have more to offer in non-traditional roles. I did read an article in which you implied that if women were denied the right to vote abortion would still be illegal. Actually, most polls show that women as a group tend to be MORE pro-life than men. And, of course, let's not forget that most abortionists are **men** and that it was the **all-male** Supreme Court that gave America Roe vs. Wade. Speaking from personal experience as a pro-life activist (female), the pro-lifers I encounter are disproportionately female, including many women who had abortions and endured a lot of physical or emotional trauma from the abortion. See [The Women Pro-Choicers](#)

Ignore and Feminists for Life (which includes both very liberal and very conservative feminists) for more on female pro-lifers.¹⁴⁴

Lise, you do spend a lot of time telling me how you have-n't read my page yet and then go on to pass along your opinions. This page is not directed towards denying freedom, it is directed at removing the totalitarian enforcement of the feminist religion upon the citizens of the United States. You can personally support females doing anything you care to, but the second you bring the government in to support your point of view you have moved away from traditional American freedom towards the Marxist totalitarianism. This page is here to help combat that wrongheaded and destructive action.

You make the same silly mistake that most antagonists of this page make. I never said that women were responsible for abortion. I never said that women were responsible for any of the ills created by the feminist movement. What I have said, over and over again, is that FEMINISTS are responsible for abortion and all the other catastrophic results of the feminist movement. It is not that complex of an idea. It is a simple distinction to make. Yet, because of the media control of Americans' thought process it is very difficult for Americans to wake up and realize that "FEMINIST" DOES NOT EQUAL "WOMAN." While I consider feminists to be the very bottom of the human barrel I consider women to be the very pinnacle of humanity.

To assert that without the feminist movement we would have had legal abortion anyway is about as intelligent as saying that without Martin Luther we would have Lutherans anyway, or that if the English people had never existed, the English language would not only exist but it would be just like it is today. The only reason that any large numbers of people, male or female, support the feminist sponsored abortion tragedy is because the media, and government have worked hand in hand to promote it. Before Roe vs. Wade, the vast majority of men AND women were disgusted by the idea of abortion. While I dispute your claim that men support abortion more than women today, it doesn't matter if it were true. What a poll tells you is how effective a propaganda campaign has been after the fact. What the real question is, is how was Roe vs. Wade made possible? It happened because male and female feminists rammed the concept down the American people's throat through the use of a combined ef-

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

fort of a choreographed propaganda campaign, associated with government strong arm tactics. Feminists brought us the slaughter of abortion, and no amount of feminists after the fact, claiming to be anti-abortion, will ever bring back the 30 million dead babies already gone. Pretending that feminists are anti-abortion will do nothing but confuse the issue in the soft brained public who gather their news from the controlled media. Feminism = abortion and abortion = feminism. To deny it is a lie. -Al-

Name: Paul

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Australia

Time: 1999-07-06 04:35:00

Comments: Al- I was not very clear in my previous letter (No. 79). When I said "site", I meant "manhood forum" (which is one part of the site) which is still down and which is where men were postings. I don't like that site much, anyway. It is more of those sites which concentrate on making men "better" so that this world can be a better place. Their main interest is not in addressing prejudices against men. This is the reason I believe that may have shut down the forum intentionally, because lately the comments there were not along the lines of their mainstream philosophy.¹⁴⁵

Thanks for the clarification Paul! -Al-

Name: Feminist

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Ohio

Time: 1999-07-09 12:59:00

Comments: You said in your website that all feminists hate men. Not all of feminists hate men. And you say that you don't hate women, but on your website you talk about how us women are inferior to men. You talk about how every women should be a homemaker and should be taking care of her children. You can't convince me that every women on the planet would automatically make a wonderful homemaker just because she's a women. I find it very

insulting that you think women shouldn't have the right to vote. I get the impression that you don't think that women are as intelligent as men are. Well, it is a proven fact that women, in general, are more intelligent than men. Deny it all you want, but it's true.¹⁴⁶

A term like "all" is of course going to cover the fringe elements who do not understand what it is they are talking about. There are no doubt some stay at home moms who never have had a job outside of the house and never will who consider themselves feminists. When I use the term "all" I am referring to the prohibitive majority. I hope this clears that up for you.

All serious feminists do hate real men. They hate men who rule, men who lead, and men who refuse to be dominated by the feminist agenda. They may be sexually attracted to males, but they hate masculinity. You can see the hate in the names they try to label men with and you can see it in their actions. The feminist movement has been driven by the man-hating lesbian NOW leadership, who have provided us with such witty slogans as, "A woman needs a man, like a fish needs a bicycle." That is man hating in my book.

There are women who are terrible homemakers. There are women also who are retarded. Do we then set up our society for the incompetent and the mentally defective? We do if we are feminists. But the saner members of society realize that our laws and customs must reflect the vast majority's capabilities and tendencies not the tiny minority's. Again, the vast majority of women would make excellent homemakers, and they should be given that opportunity. Feminism is doing all that it can to remove that opportunity and that is what I am fighting against.

If the truth is insulting to you, it is unfortunate. Women have demonstrated a clear inability to vote with their brains instead of their hearts. They have put men into office of a liberal mind, and slowly destroyed our system of government. Today we are on the verge of slipping into chaos, followed by a police state, thanks to our soft hearted women. Women are intelligent. In some areas their brains work better than men's. In others they are not as good. Men and women are different from each other, mentally and physically. Live with it because it isn't going away. We even know why now. (See the Bottom Line) Women have an emotional makeup which

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

helps them to be great mothers. They are softer and easier, wishing to "make nice" and wishing for everyone to "just get along." They (again, the majority of women) will not make the hard choices required to run a government free from the socialism that is destroying America today.

Actually the female IQ is slightly lower than the male IQ but it is negligible. Females tend to score higher in verbal skills and in reading, especially in the earlier years of life. Males are far better in math and science skills. So, the facts are out there to see. Denial of the facts, if it is to come will be from yourself.

-Al-

Name: Anupam Singh

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: New Delhi, INDIA

Time: 1999-07-11 13:38:00

Comments: If there is one thing I positively despise, it is American culture, not only has it ruined the lives of Americans themselves, it has also crushed our 5000 year old culture. The greatest disease we have imported from the "developed" world is the Feminist movement. Any anti-male law (and other man hating prejudices) that is passed in USA, soon reaches India-as it is a "progressive nation." "With the highest divorce rate on planet earth and a multi billion dollar porn industry, you have probably slipped into the worst moral decline ever known to mankind (oops, "human kind"). Forget it Al, you can do nothing with the help of a darned website.¹⁴⁷

I trust it is just your frustration speaking. You have to realize that feminism is completely unnatural and that in the long run it must fall. This web page will help any who have their brains turned on, to realize that more people out there can see the insanity of feminism than they might of thought before. That can bolster up their courage to actually voice their opinions in public. Once enough people stop pretending that feminism should be taken seriously and start ridiculing it as it should be, you would be surprised how quickly it can be driven underground where it belongs.

Oh and by the way it is not American culture you have a problem with. It is the mass media's culture which has been

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

created for the most part since 1960 by those who own the media. The American people originally opposed every one of the destructive changes which has happened since then. The controlled courts force things like feminism and abortion upon us, without our consent. I believe a revolution is in our future where these wrongs can be set right once again, and the real American culture will reappear.

-Al-

Name: Tariq Khan

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 1999-07-12 12:02:00

Comments: This is in response to our friend Anupum Singh (letter 83). I agree with almost everything you have said except the bit about "we can't do anything". My friend, we can and we should. Anti feminist movement is not all about this site maintained by some guy "Al". It is about educating men and raising their consciousness about the prejudices and discrimination against them. Only then men will unite and once united they will become a force to be reckoned with. Also keep in mind that every movement at first is weak and seems hopeless (study the history of feminism)but with persistence it gains strength and momentum and achieves results. I am not saying this all is gonna be easy but if we quit trying we will MAKE SURE that nothing will happen. Warm Regards.¹⁴⁸

Well said Tariq!

-Some guy named Al- :-)

Name: Michelle

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 1999-07-15 11:15:00

Comments: I am really offended by your website. You talk about how men are superior to women. Who are you to say what a woman should and shouldn't do with her life? If a woman wants to work in the workplace instead of being a homemaker, that's her choice. If

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

she wants to play sports, that's her choice. If she wants to get an abortion, that's her choice. If she wants to enter the military, that's her choice. No one has the right to tell a women what she can and cannot do. If you don't think that women should have any rights in this country, then I suggest that you get the hell out of this country and move to one of the middle eastern countries where women are treated like slaves!¹⁴⁹

Michelle, you are somewhat confused and it is distressing you. You see I am attempting to stop people like you from forcing their ideas upon America. If the government were not involved in the feminist movement it would be a non-issue. Most women would love to stay home with their kids and raise them correctly. It is people like you who have created the situation where many of these women are confused into thinking they "have to work." We have a school system which is programming our little girls into thinking housewives are idiots and useless women. We have a court system which forces industries to hire and promote women, not based on merit but upon gender. That is oppression and totalitarianism. It is also suicidal for our country.

I never said that women could not play sports. I only said that they do not play sports as well as men. It is a fact and you are not a very observant person if you believe otherwise.

You greatly error when you make the erroneous claim that a woman has the "right" to join the military. No one has the right to join the military. Only those who fully qualify can be selected to go into the military. The military is NOT a social experiment. It is the only defense our country has from aggression from outside our borders. It must be the strongest it can be, and that means only the best, and most physically fit can be accepted for service. It is clear that women do not measure up because the military has repeatedly lowered its standards to allow women to enter. That is treason pure and simple, because it weakens our military. People like you don't care whether America is defended. You only care about yourselves and your agenda.

You also error in your claim that a woman has the right to kill her child. No one has that right. No one.

It is completely ignorant of you to say that my page proclaims in any way that women have no rights. Women have always had rights in America and those rights which they

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

have always had, I defend enthusiastically. A woman has the right to walk her streets in safety, even at night. A woman has the right to be provided for by her husband. A woman has a right to be a homemaker if she chooses and to be home when her children are. A woman has a right to expect to be treated like a lady in public. These are the rights a woman always had in America before the feminist infection hit. I support those rights completely.

Just because your ideas have been forcibly installed the last few decades by our tyrannical courts does not mean that you have taken final possession of my country. You have no right or authority to ask me to leave the land of my birth and of my ancestors. I will stay and I, or my children will see your insane feminism fall into the dust where it belongs.

-Al-

Name: Sam

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 1999-07-19 12:10:00

Comments: Al, It's been a pleasure reading your responses to the posts here. I must say-- you're good! What I find utterly perplexing, though, is why things that are so obvious to people like you and me are a source of so much slipping and sliding to others. It's as if they live in another universe. But I guess such is life. I wish I had more time to contribute to the guest book, but the demands of life make it difficult. For now, I'd like to back up and add to your response in post 82 where you stated that younger women tend to have higher verbal and reading skills, and men have far better math and science skills. The results of this difference have been obvious to me from my own experience. I am an engineer (which requires higher math and science skills) and am currently attending law school (which requires higher verbal and reading skills). The percentage of female students at my law school is a little over 50% (of total students), while the percentage of female engineering students at my alma mater has stubbornly held at around 20% for the past several years. Moreover, these statistics are typical for universities across America. As far as intelligence (as measured by IQ tests) is concerned, I think the sexes are, on the whole, nearly equal, although the very

most intelligent people in the world are probably almost entirely men. However, from what I've seen, men (whether they're engineers or attorneys) are clearly more competitive than women. Men by nature tend to be status seekers; women tend not to. And I think that's interesting. I'll be posting again at some point. Until then, keep up the good work.¹⁵⁰

Sam,

Thank you for the kind words. I am not as perplexed as I once was as to why people are so confused on what should be very simple issues. What is the single most powerful thought, and behavior modifying, device in America today? What do most Americans rely on to determine what is right and wrong in the areas of society and politics? Is it not the mass media generally, and the television specifically? The owners of the mass media, for almost this entire century, have not been mainstream Americans. They do not have their roots in Europe, as America does, nor are they Christians, as most Americans are. Is it the least bit surprising then, that they have been using their power to mold America into something new, something foreign and something which completely fails to fit the needs and wants of the majority of Americans?

The power of the television is more responsible for the destructive changes in our society than any other single force. It took centuries to change Rome and pull it down, because they did not have television to speed the process along like America has. We have been conquered in mere decades, because of the ability of the television to amplify change with its regenerative feedback.

Every single destructive change that has occurred over the last 40 years has been imposed upon us through the propaganda of the media, which distorted each of these issues. A story which supported their agenda received front page billing, and was written in a very positive manner. Any story which opposed their agenda, was routinely covered up completely. If it should make it into the news, it was written in a very negative manner and/or buried way back in the "who cares" section of the news. After the news has finished its nightly propaganda session, next the nightly television "entertainment" propaganda sessions begin. They are just as blatantly pushing the same agenda, because they are owned and controlled by the same people. It is not an accident and it is

not going to fix itself.

Anyone who watches television on a very regular basis is going to mostly believe what the media owners want them to believe. The vast majority of citizens liked their society of the 1950s. Today, nearly every one of their most cherished and important beliefs have been eradicated. Their world class schools have been destroyed, many of their safe and crime free neighborhoods have been turned into drug infested war zones, and their system of ethics is, well let's face it, gone. You would have been hard pressed to find many Americans on the street who believed that abortion was an option in the 1950s. They thought it was murder, and so did the vast majority of doctors. Today, thanks to the brainwashing of the media, there is great support for abortion. Even those who don't like it still tolerate it.

Abortion is only one issue, but there are many other issues, including feminism. People are confused on these issues because they have turned their minds, and their families' minds over to those who own and operate the media. It is as simple as that.

Your insights into the professional world are most appreciated. They match very closely what the book *Brain Sex* has documented. Most leaders are both intelligent and competitive, and that is why men have always been the predominate leaders throughout history in all societies. Society mirrors biology. Societal sexual roles came from the biological differences between the sexes. Throughout history, it is not a question of the society forcing the roles upon the sexes but rather the sexes forcing the roles onto the society. That is why the older system worked so much better. That is why marriages used to last and they don't any more. That is why feminism has caused so much harm to everyone it touches. **Feminism IS FORCING ROLES UPON THE SEXES!** It is the very thing that it claims to be fighting against. It is forcing women and men into doing that which is not natural. It can never work in the long term. It will fall of its own weight.

Feminism never could have come this far on its own either. Look at the stance that the media has taken on feminism. Where do you see any criticism of it, even in its most radical forms? Instead you see news shows on all the local stations being anchored by females. Female reporters are everywhere. Every time there is an issue that might affect women, the media runs to the lesbian controlled, numerically insignificant,

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

National Organization of Women to find out what the "women's point of view" is. In television "entertainment" shows, they put women into every unnatural position they can think of in order to make feminism seem more natural. In the media, total support is all that you will ever see for feminism. Is it any wonder that the movement has been so effective in destroying our society?

In my opinion, anyone who uses the television as entertainment (especially for children!) should have his head examined. And anyone who uses television to keep informed on issues is a fool. It is like drinking from a poisoned fountain and expecting health as a result. The truth is not available on the television and that is a plain and simple fact.

Thanks for your supportive and insightful comments! -Al-

Name: Anupam Singh

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: New Delhi, INDIA.

Time: 1999-07-20 00:47:00

Comments: Dearest AL, You and Tariq Khan(#84) seem to have taken umbrage to my letter. My friend, I never meant to insult your culture (I do realise that you are a patriot) but whether you like it or not that is the "culture" that is being forced down the throats of the third world, and the majority of Americans themselves seem to believe in it ("you are not a real man" unless you are pro-feminist).

I suppose it is obvious that I am frustrated, tell me, don't I have reason to be? If you keep up to dated with current events, you may have heard that in the recent Kargil crisis, 700 Indian soldiers (mostly aged 22-23) have died an inglorious death at 7000 mts. above sea level; so have the Pakistanis--this is not about who's at fault--ultimately both sides have lost young men---but the Damn Press still thinks it (and us) needs to thank the "men and women of the Indian Army--though it is a fact that in India--not one woman is in active combat (fortunately we have not risked the safety of our borders with Pakistan, China, atleast till now!). The maximum sympathy is also being shown for widows of dead soldiers---tell me now, what the hell is a man supposed to think?

The fact remains that women in our country are being "artificially propped up" by Parliamentary legislation and stupid anti-male

Law courts.

Why I said "we cant do anything"----is because we(men) have no unity--we know it--history is cyclical they say, let's see when this wheel comes full circle. PS:1: Women may have "higher verbal" skills etc.(Shakespeare, anyone?) but the fact is that the greatest living writer in the English language is still a Man--V.S.Naipaul--feminists can check up on that. PS:2:Dearest Michelle (#85), I am not a Muslim, but I still say Shut your mouth and go and see the "middle east" for yourself and then pass judgement, The SHARIYAT gives more than Equal rights to women--penalty for Rape is Stoning to Death! You know you are not a man's equal ,however if you love to live in fantasies rather than reality, so be it, but women will never rule the world.¹⁵¹

My Dear Anupam, I merely wished to point out that your negativity, while quite understandable was not going to be productive. A depressed man cannot even break paper chains because he has no will to do so.

Your complaint about what passes for American culture today is certainly valid. I just wanted to point out to you that the culture I grew up in is not the one which has taken over America today. The average American has had little to do with creating this culture. The greatest failing of the normal, average American today is his stupid addiction to the television. If there is one single thing which allowed the cultural cancer to run wild in America, and therefore the world, it is the television. Those who control the television have no love for real American culture. They are primarily responsible for all of the changes that you and I find so distressing. Since many Americans have unfortunately bought in to the destructive ideas put forward by those who control the television, you of course are right in condemning them for it. But remember that your people are also buying into those same stupid ideas and they are just as responsible for their mistakes. What you and I need to focus on are those who originated and propagated the ideas in the first place! They are the real villains!

I too am sick and tired of hearing about the "men and women" of the armed services, when in reality it is only the men who have done anything of consequence in the military. It is all part of the same package. The constant wearing away

of resistance by the continual dripping of water. It is always there and slowly forces people to change their minds, not through logic or information but by mental control.

A woman in the military is a useless wife and mother. She can't be there for her family as she should be. So, I don't have a lot of sympathy for any man who marries one. A widow of a soldier on the other hand I have a great deal of sympathy for. So, I agree with giving them the honor and sympathy they deserve. They made a great sacrifice in the defense of your country. The sick and twisted part of the equation is that we are told we should both treat women as something special (which I agree with) and we are supposed to treat women just like men (which is ridiculous). That leads to confusion, and confusion, is just what these propaganda specialists love. Confusion makes people pliable because they have nothing solid to hold on to, nothing with which to compare and evaluate by. Logic and reality are made to look wrong in the politically correct way of viewing things. If you cannot rely upon your own powers of observation, then how can you tell what is true and what is false? You grow up and you see that girls are completely different than boys. They think differently, they are weaker and less aggressive. You know this from personal experience. Then along comes the government to tell you that your observations are all wrong. You are forced to think in such a way as to accept falsehood as truth and truth as falsehood. Once the evaluation of truth is taken away from your own powers to observe and analyze, and is instead put into the hands of the government you are doomed.

Women in the workplace are being artificially propped up everywhere they exist. How else would they even be there? The men are kept off balanced by the crazy laws that have enforced the acceptance of women in places where they don't fit in or belong. You are absolutely right that men are going to have to join forces and rid our society of the ones in government who force things like feminism upon us.

The edge that females have in verbal skills is mostly lost by the time students reach the university level. Women do process language differently than men and many of them make excellent translators. There are plenty of men who are very good with words, and we do not need any women working in any area to make that area function at a maximum level. Women add nothing of consequence to any workplace which men could not do at least as well. Being able to get

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

your point across is all well and good, but you must have a point to get across first, and Shakespeare certainly stood head and shoulders above any other playwright on that score. Men are more prone to be geniuses than women are, and that includes the area of verbal expression. On average, women can find the right word for what they wish to say easier than the average man can. They learn to read easier and younger than males do. More males have to go into remedial reading courses in the younger years. But, as I said, by the university level the males have caught up in their reading skills and their natural competitiveness tends to push them right past the females in all areas of academic endeavor. Even though the colleges promote having females in every course of study, men still dominate them all, if not in numbers, at least in position. In areas where women can almost hold their own with men (e.g. law) they congregate in large numbers.

I think your message to Michelle can stand on its own.

Thanks for sharing your thoughts! -Al-

Name: Myers Davis

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Tennessee

Time: 1999-07-21 10:41:00

Comments: Outstanding information!¹⁵²

Myers, thank you for signing the guest book and for your kind words. -Al-

Name: Veteran's Wife

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: PA

Time: 1999-08-06 04:01:00

Comments: Dear Al, 'Am continually amazed,,, how one "darned website" has caught the attention from people across the globe. Was not aware how America's busy-body legislations have slammed India's culture with both barrels. So much for diversity and tolerance! These mens' responses have prompted a question in this reader's mind, concerning politically fashionable ideas on how India has treated it's poooooorr women. If the feminist's are quoting the Rg

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

Veda, like they've doing to Aristotle's Politics, (only read portions, but was surprised to learn...) stands to reason, India's grandmothers were not (all) despised, and brutalized vi(iii)ctims of their nation's grandfathers. Gee, would not the same follow suit within Islamic cultures, as well? At the risk of sounding like some lil'-Miss-Polly...seasoned men may assert, that nothing can be done to reclaim what's right. Respectfully, I disagree. What one person can do, via internet--and snail-mail... Meanwhile, the namby-pambyists are busy lobbying foot-ins, barging into a men's houses, (he wasn't even home) and going through their things. You're right about the junk that's being pandered on television--while viewers passively consume, for hours on end. Even those "science" programs are politically warped. Susan B.¹⁵³

Susan,

Your words are pearls. Thank you for placing them in my guest book.

I feel that one most disgusting thing above all others that feminism has done (aside from slaughtering 30 million babies) is to heap contempt upon all the wonderful wives and mothers of the past. All those great women, who raised well their families, usually large families, are the reason we are here today. To degrade those noble women by telling our daughters that those women were stupid, unfulfilled, slaves is as low as anyone can go.

I agree with you completely! The feminists care not for culture, history or truth. They will twist and mold all of these and more in order to promote their lying cause. With the media in full support behind them, there is great need for all people who are aware of what is going on to speak up in whatever manner they have available to them. We must all be silent no longer!

-Al-

Name: Tariq Khan

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Australia

Time: 1999-08-08 01:09:00

Comments: Hi Al, this is me again. The more I understand femi-

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

nism the more I realize what a conspiracy of mammoth proportions it is against men. But alas, most men still don't take it seriously enough. The most sickening of all is "politically correct/feminist controlled" media. I will let you in on a secret. Wanna be rich and famous soon? Write a book (any type fiction/non-fiction) which systematically degrades men and exalts women and get ready for reviews which call it "fresh" and "authentic". Include the mandatory bit about the mutilation of male genitals by females and it will also be "refreshingly funny". I just hope sites like yours do wake up men to what is going on. Women around the world are getting governments to pass all sorts of laws in their favour while most men don't even know what is going on. Please do continue this important work. You have my full moral support.¹⁵⁴

Tariq,

Your insight is right to the point, accurate in every detail, and very much appreciated, as is your moral support!

The media, in any democracy is the single most powerful entity there is. Especially when one of the media is a device as mentally controlling as the television. It is clear that those who control the media are leftist and are in full support of the feminist cause. There is no other way that so much damage could have been done so quickly to our once stable and strong families.

-Al-

Name: Nicole

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 1999-08-13 10:53:00

Comments: I don't agree with your webpage at all. First of all, some feminists may hate men, but not all of them do. That's like saying that civil rights leaders like Martin Luther King were racist because they wanted black people to be equal. Second of all, women are not weak. We live longer than men, and we can handle pain better. Also, who are you to say that all women like being sex objects? I do not consider myself a sex object, and most women I know do not consider themselves as sex objects. Yeah, there are some women who like dressing and acting like a whore, but most women are not

like that.¹⁵⁵

Nicole,

Of course it is absurd to say that all people of any category have any characteristic. For example to say that all feminists have 2 legs is wrong because some have one leg or no legs due to accident or birth defects. So, to say that all feminists hate men is absurd. However the net result of the feminist movement has been to express a hatred of men and even more so a hatred of children. (Note the latchkey kids and an even more clear statement of their hatred look at the over 30 million dead babies.)

You are completely out of touch with reality if you think that women are not weaker than men. I did not say that women are short lived, I said that they are weaker. For your educational benefit, that means that men can lift more weight than women can. That is a fact that only a brainwashed ideologue would even consider debating. It has been demonstrated over and over again that women cannot compete with men on an equal basis physically. In each area where the government has forced its agencies to accept women into their ranks (e.g. military, police force, FBI, fire departments) the physical standards for that agency had to be lowered in order to allow women entry. That is documented proof that women are weaker than men are, for anyone so simple of brain to not have been able to figure it out for themselves.

Your use of the word "all" is once again inappropriate. The point of my page on the area of "sex objects" is that women who wear short skirts (short shorts, low cut blouses, skimpy bathing attire at the pool or beach, etc. etc.) are doing so because they are interested in being thought of as sex objects. This includes many of the feminists who were leaders in the feminist movement as well as many women who have entered the business community. The feminist movement was a driving force in the "sexual liberation" of women, which only intensified the view of men that women were sex objects. Interesting that you should use the word "whores" to describe these feminists. The net result of the feminist movement has been to severely decrease the chances that a women getting married will be a virgin, and to increase the chances that she will have the morals of the type of women to whom you referred.

-Al-

Name: Louis

Website: FREEDOMSITE

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: (gulag archipelago) Canada

Time: 1999-09-01 14:48:00

Comments: Greetings Al; Just want to add my support to your very informative site. Isn't it funny that the founders of the modern feminist movement all hail from the same "tribe"? Just an observation which I know you can't really express.¹⁵⁶

There are a number of things about the feminist movement that should make Americans, and those who are following her, sit up and take notice. The movement is one that breeds self-destructive behavior, and anti-social behavior. It is focused on destroying the traditional family, which is in line with liberal causes in general which are focused on destroying traditional America. Why do Americans tolerate it? If they could ever pull their heads away from their television sets long enough to think a thought of their own they wouldn't tolerate it. Not for a second.

Your point is indeed beyond the scope of this web page.
Thanks for sharing your thoughts! -Al-

Name: Tariq Khan

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Australia

Time: 1999-09-12 22:31:00

Comments: Hi Al,. I think the current shape of feminism has the seeds of self-destruction firmly planted in itself. When a movement is based on a painful emotion like hatred it cannot last very long. In fact I have reached the point in my understanding where I no longer consider this issue to be worthy of my time. I consider it a passing trend. A fashion of times. Sure it can affect those of us who live in this time and we must take appropriate actions to guard ourselves against its vileness, but that is as far as I m gonna get involved. I will try to marry a girl who will not blindly subscribe to whatever current radical-feminism teaches, and if I have a daughter I will try to keep her from getting brainwashed by the all-powerful/all-mighty

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

western media which currently specializes in teaching misandry. Hatred (especially for opposite gender) requires so much negative emotional investment and makes one so much miserable that even if it results in one's acquiring some seemingly worthwhile "tangible" benefits, in the end that person is a loser. And that I certainly wouldn't wish upon any woman I love. I sometimes read the feminist entries in guest books and I see so much pain behind the obscenities and cussing. Imagine someone desiring to "cutting up" members of opposite gender (SCUM). What criminal insanity! And what morbid, sadistic pleasure that thought must give to a sick mind. The sad thing is, that pain is based on the misperception and the distorted view of reality. Based on that alone I can say women 30 years ago were happier. You don't know how lucky you are to be married to that fine woman (and she doesn't know how lucky she is to be so peaceful and happy with her husband in times when it is considered almost shameful to be happy with, or appreciative of, one's husband). My respects to the respectable lady in your life—
Tariq.¹⁵⁷

I think that, while it is true that feminism is doomed, and it will ultimately self destruct, we must still take a stand against it. We must speak out, and not just hide around the corner and watch the spectacle. Remember that communism has the exact same seeds of self destruction within it. It is just a matter of time before any communistic nation will fall into bankruptcy and chaos. Better than just standing by knowingly, and letting communism take over our society, and allowing it to run its inevitable course, is to fight it every step of the way. I am glad that there were those who stood up against it in the 1950s. While socialism, the maggot stage of communism, is growing rapidly, things are far better today because right thinking men have stood their ground. In a like manner, feminism must be opposed, in order to save our families and to protect our women and children from what will come if we do not.

You are absolutely right that feminists often display some serious psychological problems. To be filled with that much rage and hatred, is bound to take a serious mental toll. The vile language, the lashing out, the foaming at the mouth hysteria, are each a sign of complete frustration and a serious imbalance in their emotional state. They deserve pity, but

they do not deserve acceptance of their insanity, by our society, our government, or our schools. Insanity should be treated, not followed!

Tariq you are wrong! I do know how lucky I am to be married to that fine woman. My wife and I often discuss the unhappy feminists and how lucky that we are to live outside of that whole diseased mindset. We are happy, and aware of how many other people are not, as their marriages deteriorate into divorce, while ours just gets better and better.

When you find the right girl, with your attitude, you will be assured a long and happy marriage. Your wife will be lucky to have such a husband, and you two, from your happy state, will look at that chaos created by feminism and shutter at how people could willingly choose to live like that, and destroy their own happiness, and the future of their own children.

-Al-

Name: FeministBitch

Website: Feminist Bitch Speaks

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 1999-10-03 22:23:00

Comments: Roles work well enough if you happen to fit them. But what of the men who don't fit the competitive breadwinner mold, or the women who are not social and nurturing by nature? And what of those who want to pursue work for neither "breadwinning" or "nurturing" purposes: the scientists, the artists, the poets, the scholars?

Also, regarding the "fragile" woman, this idealization was the luxury of the middle-to-upper classes. Working-class women always labored as hard as the men they worked beside.

As an antidote to your heavy nostalgia, I suggest you read a book called *The Way We Never Were*. If things aren't perfect now, they certainly weren't "in the good old days." For millenia people have been bitching that things aren't as good as they used to be; some things never change. ;-)

By the way, I notice a lot of references to Christianity and the Bible on these anti-feminist sites. Are you planning on eliminating atheism and agnosticism as well as feminism and the 19th Amendment?¹⁵⁸

I find it interesting that you call yourself a feminist-female dog in your name. The term "bitch," when applied to a woman, originally referred to a slut who was so sexually loose that she would mate with any man, just like a bitch (female dog) in heat. There was no greater insult then, or for that matter now, than to call a woman a dog. Yet today, thanks to the feminists, such a label is taken with pride. It ranks right up there with the other "accomplishments" of this insane and destructive movement.

As is typical of the feminist, your only concern is for the abnormal and the non-feminine woman. Those who do not fit the traditional roles of course will have a harder time of it, just as they always have in American society, or for that matter, in any other society. What the feminist fails to mention, or even give a thought to, is the vast majority of women who do fit the traditional roles, and because of feminism, are forced out of their normal role. Totalitarian governmental rule over the majority by any minority is not what a representative republic is supposed to be.

No matter what pursuit a woman desires, it is not, as the feminists demand, the role of the government to pave her path for her and force others to support that pursuit in any way. Businesses are not morally obligated to hire any women at all if they choose not to. (The only consideration should be the policy of the company itself as to whom it will hire or not.) We find that in the past when a woman was truly driven into science or the arts, she managed to work in those areas. Yes, she was a misfit, but she did what she wanted to do. The destructive interference of the government into our societal norms has been terminal for our families and is creating an egalitarian nightmare, where men have to walk on eggshells around women at work to avoid law suits and the loss of their jobs. Complete departments have been created in all large companies, specifically to deal with the problems created in the workplace by the entrance of women into it.

You completely missed the point of The Fragile Female article. The point is that the feminists claim women are interchangeable with men, that they can walk into the workplace and do the same job as men, but when you look at what has happened, it belies that claim. Law suits, and government regulations have completely taken over businesses in the United States, all to support the Fragile Female.

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

As far as women working hard, I never said that they did not! Any housewife with children today works as hard as her husband does. Yet, throughout human history there has always been the division of labor between men's work and women's work, equally hard but geared towards the strengths of the individual gender. That is not nostalgia but fact!

The leftist takeover of our country in the 1960s made real changes that were preplanned. Those changes have been very destructive to our society. To try and paint all commentary showing up those faults and negative consequences of that movement as mere nostalgia is absurd and dishonest.

I cannot speak for any other anti-feminist site. On my page, I have a section dedicated to overthrowing the absurd concept of a "feminist Christian." The Bible is completely against feminism and therefore so is any legitimate form of Christianity (since the Bible is the only source of knowledge about it). I am not promoting that religion on my page. My page attacks feminism upon rational, and biological grounds, and those grounds are sufficient to logically rip feminism to shreds.

-Al-

Name: A radical feminist

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Canada

Time: 1999-10-07 09:05:00

Comments: Hi al, I just red some of your articles. I found them interesting and I respect your opinions even if I totally disagree with the largest part of them. First of all, I am a radical feminist but I am not lesbian and I don't hate men. In your article "I'm not feminist but..." you're asking feminists to make a sexist effort. I am comfortable with that. I can make some sexist efforts sometimes. For example, I can admit that the largest part of candidates for some physical demanding jobs are men and I strongly respect a woman who give up a full time job for taking care of her children. But I see that you and some other men will never be ready for a little non-sexist effort. For example, admitting the fact that many women who had skills for some jobs have been rejected only because of their gender, admitting the fact that many women have been forced into homemaking or admitting the fact that some ultra-sexist societies are far of being

perfect. In history some women have done important contribution but this fact is also denied. The vast majority of women I know are very good and competitive in some area and, fortunately, they have the opportunity to make their skills useful. I can't see something wrong with that. As long as not all men won't be able of some non-sexist efforts, radical feminists like me will exist. A question came in my little feminist's head after seeing your webpage. Every young girl have some women for models. If you had a daughter, who would you want her to admire in the famous women you know? I'm sorry for my english and for making people's lives such a nightmare!¹⁵⁹

The fact that you admit that women are not qualified for all jobs, disqualifies you from the title radical feminist today. In fact any man who says that is labeled a sexist pig by the N.O.W. leadership. I have listened to the radical feminist state quite unequivocally that staying home "is no longer an option for women today" because it limits their horizons. You are a feminist but your only radical stance is your anti-feminist leaning towards supporting homemakers.

I admit that most men are forced into going to work each day. They would naturally much rather go out and play golf or go fishing than earning a paycheck. The absurd claim that women are forced into their roles and men are not is really getting old. Most men do not want to be soldiers. Most men do not want to be tied down to a 9 to 5 job every day. Wake up and smell the coffee. Life is tough and you have to do things that you do not necessarily want to do. If you are going to be a positive part of a family and a society, you have to give up some of the selfish tendencies that you have. A man has to give up chasing women, no matter how much he likes it, when he gets married. He takes on the responsibility of supporting a family. Many men take that responsibility so seriously that they end up dying young from the hard and hazardous work that they have taken on in support of the family. Look at all the graves around battlefield and see where men have sacrificed everything for their society and their families.

When a company chooses to hire a man who is supporting a family, over a woman who is not, that is a good and honorable thing to do, regardless of the qualifications of the candidates. It is a pro-family policy to have. It is the policy that most companies had in the past. In addition to that, young

women often leave their jobs to get married or to have and raise children. Women are a different risk for longevity and dependability on the job. The world is sexist because there are serious differences between the sexes.

Perhaps the biggest point you are overlooking is that it is contrary to a free society to have the government telling companies who they must hire and who they must promote. If a company should decide that it will be more profitable by hiring an all male staff then it should have that right. If on the other hand, it feels that an all female staff will do better, then it should be allowed to do that. If a company feels that it will be more profitable with a mixed staff of males and females, then it should have the right to hire them. The flaw of feminism, the thing which is destroying our society, is the fact that feminism is being enforced upon the population by the government. That is oppressive and an extreme infringement upon our freedom as a people. We do not choose whether we accept or reject feminism. The government chooses for us.

While feminism focuses on the small inequities of life for the abnormal woman who is actually more driven to career rather than family, they have created a nightmare for the normal, family-oriented woman. She is dragged to work, and taken away from her children, often going through a divorce and left with being a single mother.

The best thing in the world that the government can do is get out of the way! Let society go the way it wants to naturally go, rather than have some small special interest group enforcing their views upon all the others by law. There is where the greatest injustice will always be found.

If I had a daughter I would want her to admire the most admirable women in the world that I have known: my wife, my mother, my grandmother and great-grandmother. These ladies have all been exceptional women who were focused on their families, and who were there for their children. These moral and energetic women all had an input in making me who I am today. They are the reason that I admire women so much, and understand that a home is not possible without a mother there to run it.

Thanks for stopping by. -Al-

Name: Tracey Taylor

Website:

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 1999-10-08 18:19:00

Comments: Great website! I am a woman, and do agree with everything here, including repealing of the 19th Amendment. (especially after reading all the pages on why women shouldn't vote!) Thank you for the informative articles.¹⁶⁰

Thank you for dropping in and sharing your words of support! Please come back often.

-Al-

GUEST BOOK – OCTOBER-NOVEMBER 1999

| | |
|---|--|
| 10/09/99 09:42:36 PM | |
| Name: | Caveman Al |
| Website Title: | The Chauvinist Corner |
| Do you consider yourself a feminist? | No way! |
| Comments: | I changed my guest book provider and saved my old Guest Book entries in a seperate file.* ¹⁶¹ |

| | |
|---|--|
| 10/09/99 11:15:10 PM | |
| Name: | KEITH |
| Do you consider yourself a feminist? | HELL NO |
| How did you find out about my site? | [Wonderin'] if all men really fell for the PC crap of having themselves look like fools becuse of their gender |
| Where are you from? | USA |

* The First Guest Book entries you can find at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| <p>Comments:</p> | <p>[Well], I heard about the battle of the sexes boxing match..and I WASNT surprised,Mcgregor is more skilled than Chow and bigger physicaly.I dont really think it was a match that was fair to show how much powerful males are to women in strength.I mean the woman was more skilled,she was a martial artist and I heard chow had problems with his sytem before the fight(wich I dont think REALLY matters though)this fight was balogna it was awkward and I bet there are alot of women outthere who now think they are just completly EQUAL to men in all ways! BAH! the match was like putting a grown woman against a 13yr old male who had no stamina wahtsoever! DAMN now if people want to play this game then it means its OK to HIT WOMEN? well they are EQUAL in ALL ways right? so just being a female shouldnt give her special rights that say becuse of her gender her body is worth more than a mans? HELL NO! hitting women is WRONG becuse they are WEAKER! I bet if I were to hit a woman it would STILL be worse than hitting a man. anyways chow is a stupid yo yo who even LOST his 2 previous matches what a joke,hey I agree with you somewhat about this website,I been here a couple months ago and disnt disagree with too much.I forget what you think about this but I dont really think being male or female makes you smarter its just men are more aggressive so they pursue things more.¹⁶²</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Keith,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">You are right. Hitting a woman is wrong, because she is weaker, more prone to bruising, and emotionally less aggressive than a man. Women are to be protected by men, not beaten up by them!</p> <p style="text-align: center;">This was the first I had heard of the match you referred to. I could see obviously it was a joke. So, I went out on the net and looked it up,</p> |
|-------------------------|--|

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

and sure enough, it put a woman pro-boxer against a man who is today a jockey, and who had previously only fought 2 fights in his life -- that was over 3 years ago -- and he had lost them both. He has never won a professional fight, ever! He was not even scheduled to fight this one originally. He was the trainer of another fighter, Hector Morales (who incidently said his mother did not want him hitting a woman). Morales could not come, so Chow filled in at the last minute. Even so, she only out pointed him, apparently not hurting him at all. Even many members of the female boxing crowd called it a shameless sideshow!

When you see a woman win the world title in any legitimate weight category, there may be some point to this discussion, but that is not going to happen, because there is no woman alive who can stay with the best man in any weight division, or any of the top men in any weight division. I remember the Silver Bullets female baseball team running all over the country, with the very best female talent in the nation, and they played against second rate men's teams. Their record was abysmal, something like 4 - 37 in the one year that I tracked what they were doing. It would be like the World Champions of MLB playing against sandlot teams and losing almost all of their games. Female athletes are second rate. There are of course second rate male athletes too, and so some women can beat some men on rare occasions, but the very best woman will always lose to the best 20% or 30% of the best men, and 90% of women will lose to the average man.

You are right that men are more aggressive, bigger and stronger than women. If that were all there were to it, given equal intelligence, that would be enough to put men in charge, as they have been throughout history. However, there is also proof now of mental differences in normal men and women. The male and female brains are physically different and they view reality differ-

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>ently. The brains of men and women have different strengths and weaknesses, as well as different emotional characteristics. (See <u>The Unavoidable Bottom Line</u>.)</p> <p>Thanks for stopping by my page and sharing your thoughts. -Al-</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|---|--|
| 10/09/99 11:38:27 PM | |
| Name: | Dotti, the PAMPERED, LOVED WIFE of the HEAD CHAUVINIST |
| Do you consider yourself a feminist? | NEVER - I'm a REAL WOMAN |
| How did you find out about my site? | Watching my husband create it! |
| Comments: | What a wonderful website that honors all women. I'm glad someone is speaking up for wives and mothers. Thanks for being the WONDERFUL husband you are - here's to another 23 years! ¹⁶³ |

| | |
|---|--|
| 10/13/99 02:08:51 PM | |
| Name: | NOYB |
| Do you consider yourself a feminist? | Yeah and I'm proud to be one |
| How did you find out about my site? | Just from looking at anti-women's rights sites |
| Comments: | UGH, this site really makes me mad. I would really like to know why you are so hateful of women. And I can't believe the nerve you have to suggest that women shouldn't have the right to vote. Do you think that men are more intelligent |

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

or something? And so what if men are more athletic and can lift heavier stuff than women. It doesn't make them superior, and the world does NOT revolve around sports. And women are NOT weak! Who are the ones who live longer? Who are the ones who give birth to children? Who are the ones who can endure more pain? Women have fought hard for years to be given the respect they deserve. If I ever have a daughter, I will teach her that as a woman she doesn't need to sit back and allow a man to take care of her. Hell, it's damn nice, but we were given voices for a reason and it wasn't to scream our mate's name during sex.¹⁶⁴

Dear NOYB,

So nice of you to drop by and share your frustration and anger with us. It is clear that you did not spend much time on my site or you would realize that I am not hateful of women at all. It is feminists who are hateful of women, and they have proved it over and over again by forcing women into the workplace, even when they would rather be at home with the kids.

It is not so much having nerve, as it is having facts, as to why I suggest that women's suffrage was (and is) a terrible idea. See Ban the 19th. Women are far too prone towards socialism for a free country. We will all be living in a gulag somewhere if we do not stop listening to the votes of women. It is not a question of intelligence but of temperament. See The Unavoidable Bottom Line.

The world may not revolve around sports, but sports are specifically designed to highlight the same skills as war uses. It is for that reason that the poor overall showing that female athletes have made when compared with males, clearly precludes females for any consideration for military service.

As a matter of fact women are weak. Would you like to compare what the world weightlifting

records are for men and women? Have you seen any women even competing, let alone winning a world's strongest man's contest? Most feminists even admit this point. Anyone who doesn't is just plain brainwashed beyond intelligent conversation.

Yes women have more longevity and they are mothers (funny as a feminist you should even mention that fact since that is the thing you are running away from the most), and I keep hearing how much pain women can take, even though the labor room does have a lot of yelling in it. That has nothing to do with strength. You can be small and petite and extremely weak and still live a long time and endure a bunch of pain. You are still weak when compared with a man.

Women had respect a long time before the modern feminist movement came along to take it away from them. I knew two of my great grandmothers, who died before the radical feminist movement trashed our women. They were highly respected women and even today their names are spoken of with honor in our family. My grandmothers were the same kind of women and they were honored, and respected for their entire lives. My mother is a big fan of my web page and just can't understand how women like you could get that messed up in your thinking. She, along with all 5 of her sisters are also very honored and respected. If you don't know that my anti-feminist wife of 23 years is honored and respected, then you haven't read much of my page, especially: [A Woman's Place](#). Feminism was never about getting respect for women. It was only about trying to make the lesbians who never fit into our society before, appear to be normal. Feminism has been to try and force our society to forget that there are both men and women in our species and there are big differences between the sexes. Feminism couldn't care less about women. It only cares about power.

What you do during sex should be a private matter, although feminists seem to relish wallow-

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>ing in crude and obscene conversation. Women have found something to use their voices for, for as long as there have been women. The feminist movement certainly did nothing to increase the use of the female voice. It probably doesn't concern you any more than it does any other feminist, but as women have been more and more "taking care of themselves" they are being murdered, raped and beaten at a far greater rate than ever before. You see when you don't have mothers at home raising their boys, and fathers have been kicked out of the house by divorce, many of those boys grow up to be selfish out of control monsters. Congratulations feminist. You win the prize for contributing to the extreme abuse of women. Enjoy it, because the price for your insane movement has only barley begun to be paid.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-Al-</p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| 10/18/99 07:16:30 AM | |
| Name: | Eric Weaver |
| Website Title: | SCMKHAMMERSKINS |
| Do you consider yourself a feminist? | NO |
| How did you find out about my site? | wandering around |
| Where are you from? | DIXIE |
| Comments: | <p>A grand site indeed! Im sure it is a huge hit with the feminist crowd. Gasp! Women stay home and tend to thier children! Such horror, its just unthinkable. Yet the liberals wonder why our children run around and kill eachother. Feminist 1 Children 0 It is fast becoming not only acceptable but rather preferred by the liberals that women are single mothers and it is even viewed</p> |

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>by many that men are a danger to the home. With the continued push of socialist views and the liberal agenda this once great nation is going to have a rather ugly new face!¹⁶⁵</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Eric, thanks for dropping by my web page and for sharing your accurate and insightful remarks! -Al-</p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| 10/20/99 11:12:45 AM | |
| Name: | AC |
| Website Title: | n/a |
| Do you consider yourself a feminist? | not by your definition |
| How did you find out about my site? | surfed onto it |
| Where are you from? | Lincoln, Nebraska |
| Comments: | <p>I am interested in your opinion of the following scenario: A woman works for 14 years as a successful, professional, software development programmer and analyst, often beating out men because she was the more qualified for a particular job. She makes 100K a year. She is not married nor has any children. She loves and respects men and finds a wonderful man and becomes engaged to be married. At age 33, she marries the wonderful man and when they start a family, she chooses to be a fulltime mother at home. She completely fulfills herself and her family's needs. She is a highly intelligent (genius level IQ), fun, engergetic, loving, compassionate person and makes a safe, loving, and educational home for her children for 18 years. She is 100% faithful to</p> |

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

her husband in every way and they are very happy together. When the children go off to college and begin their independent lives as well-adjusted, confident adults, she decides to go back to work. Her work as a fulltime mother is done so she goes back to work, realizing such a lapse (18 years) will take it's toll and adapting accordingly. What's wrong with that? Isn't that the best of both worlds? Look at the record low unemployment rate: women aren't taking jobs away from men even when women make up 1/2 of the work force. Women DO make a significant contribution in the work force in many, many ways. Teaching, medicine, science, politics, art, information technology, etc. (and I don't just mean the "masculine-minded" women and lesbians as you stated). Thoughts?¹⁶⁶

Always! :-)

1) The most important point I have to make is this: I don't care what any woman does as an individual. The only thing that I care about is how the feminists have used the government to force their agenda down the throats of Americans. They have used the courts to sue companies into submission, and to ruin men's lives. They have forced our military to lower its standards, and thereby lessen its ability to protect this nation, just to allow women entry there. They have polluted our entire school system from top to bottom with their twisted world view, and that was done with the aid of our government. Women in the workforce is a destructive and wrongheaded concept, but if we, as a democracy had chosen it for ourselves, on our own, then that would be that. But that is not the way it happened at all. We had it forced upon us by the strong arm of the law. That makes the destruction being wrought upon our citizenry an intentional and outrageous atrocity, put upon our nation, upon our people and mostly upon our children.

2) This woman you discuss is genius level, which places her into a group so small as to be insignificant in the discussion of societal sexual roles. Female geniuses have always tended to be involved in areas outside the norm for females, but according to the book Brain Sex, even the female geniuses tend to be less independent than male geniuses. Of course, any other fact you mention will be "anticlimactic" after you have mentioned her IQ. Shall we base our society on what less than 1 or 2% of the population will share in? I think not.

3) You obviously have missed the point of my web page on going through this scenario. No matter how Pollyanna like of a story you come up with, it will not change the fact that divorce has increased directly as a result of women going into the workplace. The average child today does not live with both of his real parents. Close to two-thirds of children in our society come from broken homes. The child who lives with a single mother or with a step father is far more likely to be abused. No contribution of women, even in the area of medicine, has been significant enough to justify what we are doing to our kids today because of feminism.

4) Women strut around today talking about the contributions that they make in the workplace, but men have been making contributions like that for thousands of years, and they would have continued to do it on their own, and at least as well, without any women trying to "improve" things.

5) At the same time, it is extremely important that children are raised with a mother at home. Nothing that a woman could possibly do in the workplace will make up for the abandonment of her children. (Even the most gifted of men with children, and there are very few of those, do not have the temperament to do what the average mother does.)

6) Feminists worry about creating "power"

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

for women, and as a result, turn their guns upon their one real and natural enemy: defenseless children. First they try to keep children from ever existing at all, by promoting a philosophy of life that puts women in search of a career instead of a family, pushing marriage off into the distant future. Next they try to kill the kids (abortion). Then they attempt to steal their mothers by getting the most important person in that young child's life back to work as quickly as possible after birth. The feminists steal the children's normal home life and replace it with a day care center. Then, as a direct result of the practice of feministic ideas, the children have their fathers taken from them through the act of divorce. Of course now the mother has to work harder than ever and the children see even less of her. After having most of them postponed into non-existence, many of them aborted into very short existence, and the rest treated as if they were nothing but an inconvenience that has to be taken care of, preferably by someone else, is it any wonder that what is left of our children are turning out badly?

7) One last point. There are men who have lived through playing a game of Russian Roulette. Their opponent didn't but they did. Does highlighting their stories, depicting how well they survived the game, in the most vivid detail, make the game any more sane to play? Neither does reciting glowing stories of women who go to work, and everything turns out well, because for every one of those women for whom things work out as well as they did for Cinderella, there are a hundred where working women find their lives in shambles. Every divorce is a disaster, and when children are involved, it is a totally unacceptable event.

-Al-

10/20/99 02:37:29 PM

Name: Elizabeth York

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

| | |
|---|---|
| Do you consider yourself a feminist? | no |
| How did you find out about my site? | through lycos |
| Where are you from? | U.S. |
| Comments: | <p>I thoroughly enjoyed your web site. it is refreshing to find people that are not tainted by feminist ideas. I was especially glad to read the comments posted by women, because sometimes it seems that I am the only woman who is conservative and antifeminist. I especially enjoyed the essay about feminism and Christianity. I couldn't tell you how many times I've argued with liberal-so-called-Christians about biblical femininity, and a woman's role in the church. Popular mentality has a complete disregard for the authority of Biblical teachings. My mother and brother and extended family all agree with the liberal thinking, and I am considered to be eccentric, and close-minded, because I condemn homosexuality, abortion, divorce, and the like. Your page was a joy to visit.¹⁶⁷</p> <p>Elizabeth, thank you for your kind words and for sharing your thoughts. I thank you, as I do all the traditional women who have done so, for taking the time to sign my guest book. It is important to see that there are others out there besides ourselves who do not march in lock step with the leftists.</p> <p>It is truly amazing today to see how far away most people have traveled from the things that they claim to value and honor. The Christian forgets what Christianity was originally about. He ignores what the Bible teaches,</p> |

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>while seeming to forget that the Bible is where he has his only written knowledge of what Christianity is. The American has completely forgotten what it means to be an American, or what the Founding Fathers originally had in mind. Instead he is concerned only with what the leftists have been saying for the last half century or more. It is quite depressing to see how many conservatives today are only "conserving" the destructive changes that occurred in our society in the 1960s and 1970s.</p> <p>I wish you the very best. Your (future?) husband and children will be very lucky that you will be the center of their lives!</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-Al-</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|---|--|
| 10/30/99 11:52:18 AM | |
| Name: | Mike and Francesca Williams |
| Website Title: | POOHONEY! |
| Do you consider yourself a feminist? | no |
| How did you find out about my site? | yahoo |
| Where are you from? | San Diego, California |
| Comments: | <p>So far, the ONLY thing I disagree with you on is that men must be the sole bread-winners in a family. If a stay-at-home mom admirably meets her domestic responsibilities and still brings in side income, I see no problem. Stay-at-home moms have had money-earning ventures for millennia--the problem arises when the children come second. I think that Proverbs 31:10-31 supports this view. However, the woman's value lies in her duty to her family, not in her economic exploits.</p> |

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>Congratulations on a nice site! It's nice to see that not everyone is spinelessly obedient to "political correctness."¹⁶⁸</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Mike and Francesca, thanks for dropping by the page. Unless you disagree with the idea that a man should be the primary bread winner and a woman is primarily responsible for the home, I don't see any disagreement at all. If you read my article on Proverbs 31 you will see that I never said a woman should not work at home and make a little extra money. It is leaving the home and children, in order to earn a paycheck where the trouble begins.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">As far as Political Correctness is concerned, I am utterly at war with it.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Thanks for dropping by and sharing your thoughts!</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-Al-</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|---|--|
| 11/01/99 10:55:48 AM | |
| Name: | Cathy Dawon |
| Do you consider yourself a feminist? | YES!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! |
| How did you find out about my site? | Exite |
| Where are you from? | NB, Canada |
| Comments: | <p>I can't beleive that there are still uneducated disgusting people like you in the world. It was only by chance that you were not born female. Women are just as capable as men and women who choose to be dominated by any man are in need of some serious soul searching. You're intitled to your opinions but don't convey them as fact when they are indeed fiction!¹⁶⁹</p> |

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

Cathy, your hypocrisy is showing. The facts on my page are quite valid and it is your point of view that is pure fiction. Each person is entitled to their own opinions, even feminists, as long as they do not use the government to enforce their opinions on the rest of us.

The fact is that it is absurd to say that I could have been born a different sex than I was. If my sex were different, I would no longer be me, but rather someone else. There is certainly no doubt that I could have missed my opportunity for existence, and instead a female child could have been born to my parents at that time, but that child would have been someone else, not myself. (It would have taken a different sperm cell than the one which actually started my life to create a female, and so I could not have been the same person!) The point is that sex is a basic quality of an individual. It affects the construction of the brain as well as the rest of the body. A human female is quite different than a human male. I am a human male. You are therefore in error. (Of course, with your admitting that you are a feminist, it is quite redundant to point that out.)

Your first sentence identified you as a liberal. Note the immediate use of the derogatory adjective, "uneducated". I certainly am not uneducated, and if you read my page you would know that. The fact that I interpret the data of this world differently than yourself, you assert is a sign of lack of education. That is quite arrogant, and it is the type of delusion that seems to walk hand in hand with the feminist philosophy. If you cannot out think your opposition, call them names.

You continued in that same vein, showing how weak your position is, by calling me "disgusting." Now that really accomplishes a lot doesn't it? If I just loaded up my web page with a string of all the hateful words that I could come up with that match how I feel about

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

feminists, that would be just about as intelligent as your post here.

You followed the typical approach to grammar that the feminist usually takes. You stated, "Women are as capable as men..." That is an incomplete thought. Just like the statement, "A woman has the right to choose." (Choose what?) Is all your thinking so incomplete as that? A woman is as capable as a man at doing what? Your assertion is completely false on the face it. Just for an easy proof of that, contemplate this true statement: No woman is as capable as a man at impregnating a woman. A second example is that obviously no man is as capable as a woman at having a baby. Or a third example: no man can nurse a baby. It is therefore clear that men and women are not as capable as each other for all things. So, your statement as it stands is ambiguous, incomplete and of no value whatsoever.

No doubt each one of us could put some "serious soul searching" to good use. There is nothing about a woman who has accepted the leadership of a man, that sets her aside as anything other than normal. Men are naturally the leaders and it is the female leader who is abnormal.

For those who mindlessly use television for their entertainment and news source, there is no doubt complete surprise to find that there are those out there who actually are capable of thinking for themselves. You may be deceived into thinking that all the little sheep in America are going to follow their PC masters wherever they will lead. But if you think that all the normal folks who are happy to live as traditional men and women have gone away because of your twisted little movement, you are deceived indeed. We are still here, and we are here in numbers that should frighten you and all your little feminist friends.

Thanks for dropping by!

-Al-

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

| | |
|---|---|
| 11/07/99 02:12:08 PM | |
| Name: | Jamie |
| Do you consider yourself a feminist? | No |
| How did you find out about my site? | from www.ilovewhitefolks.com |
| Where are you from? | Michigan |
| Comments: | <p>I am a 14 year old girl. I think that feminists (99%) of them are lesbians whose main goal is just to turn all women against men. Your site is cool and I don't think that women are equal to men. Men are so much stronger than us in a lot of ways. And it is true that women or girls need physical and emotional love from men and that is what makes us truly happy. Feminists Die!!!¹⁷⁰</p> <p>Thanks for stopping by Jamie! It is nice to see young ladies who are sticking up for traditional values, and who can already see the phony side of feminism. Please come back again.</p> <p>-Al-</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| 11/08/99 08:27:57 PM | |
| Name: | alicia |
| How did you find out about my site? | someone said it was a very hateful site, so i came here. |
| Comments: | <p>hmmm women want to be at home with the kids? wait a minute, are you a woman? do you know what goes on inside of a woman's head? personally, i WANT to work. i want to get out and discover things on my own. sure, i want kids</p> |

and a husband, but i want a career as well. this site is very twisted. you have a right to express your beliefs, but some of this stuff doesn't make any sense. cave man pictures? I am sure as h____ not gonna let my husband drag me out by my hair. what makes a man more matcho? i doubt it's a [sexual organ] which makes a man able to life heavy weights or support a family. the [sexual organ] does not work at a job or lift weights. therefore, men cannot be matcho just because of being men. sure, my point may seem childish in a way, but there are several women out there who want to work because they want to get off of their lazy asses and learn something! divorce isn't always a woman's fault. sometimes it's the man who cheats. i don't know what kind of environment you were brought [up in.]¹⁷¹

It is funny how the leftist can always find a way to label anything they disagree with as "hate."

There is something about the masculine minded feminist who has the same inherent trouble spelling that men seem to. There must be a connection there somewhere. You might try typing up your posts in a word processor with a spell checker and then copy and pasting it into guest books in the future. It is a trick that I always use, and I am passing it along just as a suggestion.

You certainly feel strongly that it is your right to go to work and leave your kids unattended so that they can grow up poorly raised. It is your right of course. (That is unless you expect the government to assist you.) However, if you cared at all for your kids, you would realize that you must make choices in this life. Either you are going to be a mother or you are going to be a career woman. If you try to do both you fail at one or the other, or both. But that is your choice. My page is not for the abnormal, hate-their-kids kind of selfish woman.

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

My page is about women who actually want to do a good job at raising their kids by being there at home when the kids are home. I know that is an alien concept to the self focused feminist but that is how it is.

I am not a woman, but I am not a cat either and I can tell that cats like to be petted. I never said that all women like to be pampered, or protected or provided for by a man. I only said that most normal women appreciate that sort of treatment. There are women who actually love pain, but they are not the norm and when I speak of the general term "women," I am not referring to them.

Part of becoming an adult is realizing that you have responsibilities that go beyond what you want. You may want to lay in bed all day, but things need doing. Or you may want to run out and go to work, but the kids need watching. If you want to be self centered, do so. No one is trying to stop you. Just don't expect to be praised for doing the selfish thing.

Caveman pictures. Yes my site has some of them. Why? If you had clicked on the main one you would have had an explanation for why those pictures are there. If you read any of my web page you would know that I would never drag any woman by her hair. It is a symbolism that you will not understand but that is okay it was meant to go over your head.

You have displayed a most unfortunate ignorance. You would do well to read the book *Brain Sex*, or at least the article on my page, The Unavoidable Bottom Line where I discuss this topic. Men are macho, and strong because 1) they have masculine brains, 2) they have a supply of testosterone that is between 20 to 40 times that of the average woman. This male hormone creates a competitive drive in the masculine mind that women just do not have. It also causes the physical changes in the male body which produces the increased muscle mass that only males have. If you doubt it,

take a look at a muscle magazine. You will see pictures of men and women who spend equal time at the gym, but the men have arms as big as the women weightlifters' legs. That is biology baby!

Your implication is that stay-at-home moms are lazy. You act as if they are sitting around all day doing nothing. I am sure there are some lazy stay-at-home moms. However, any mom at home who is doing her job is working just as hard as any "career woman" is. It is a full time job and then some. And the eager ones go out and help their community with volunteer work when the kids are in school. Many "career women" go to work and sit on their backsides at a desk all day. So don't try to belittle the homemaker. There is nothing lazy about the traditional wife and mother. She serves a role that is demanding and important.

How little you read and understood of my page is clear by your inane statement, "Divorce isn't always a woman's fault." Duh! I never said or even implied that women were the cause of divorce. Divorce can come from many causes. What I said on my web page is that feminism has caused the divorce rate go from moderately low, to outrageously high. Men cheat more today because of feminism. The attitude that is created in boys in school, by promoting the twisted feminist philosophy, makes it seem just fine to go chasing skirts. Boys are taught that females are "sexually liberated" today. They are all free game, thanks to feminism. Another lie that boys are taught is that females can take care of themselves, they don't need men. All this lying propaganda has been setting up the males in our society for divorce. Also, thanks to feminism, there are women all over the workplace today, so men can have 10 times the opportunity to cheat as they did before. So, yes, men do sometimes cause divorce, but feminism is the root cause of the huge number of divorces today, even when a man caught cheating is

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>listed as the grounds for divorce. Many women today are focused on career instead of family, and that produces weak relationships, cheating, and divorce on her side. Feminism is again the villain. There is no denying that increased feminism has caused increased divorces. That is not women's fault. It is feminism's fault.</p> <p>I was brought up in a loving home with my real mother and father together in the home for my entire childhood. That may be hard for a feminist to understand, but it was really a great place to grow up. Unfortunately your kids will never know that feeling.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-Al-</p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| 11/09/99 04:51:36 PM | |
| Name: | Trina |
| Comments: | <p>I don't agree at all with your webpage. But all I have to say is that the way parents raise their kids has nothing to do with the way we turn out to be. I'm 17, and a troublemaker.... You said that every kid whose raised by a homemaker grows up to be wonderful adults, well, my mom is a homemaker. I'm very bad, I get bad grades in school, and I do drugs. So you're assumption that everyone whose raised by a homemaker grows up to be perfect adults is wrong. Gandhi and Mother Theresa could of raised me and I would still be the same.¹⁷²</p> <p>You are completely wrong. The way parents raise their kids is the single most important factor in how most kids turn out. Notice the word <u>most</u> in the previous sentence. You must learn the meaning of that word, for it is the difference between truth and error. When the vast majority (not all!) of mothers were stay-at-home-moms there were far less kids like you. There were no school shootings and almost no kids using drugs at all. There is much evidence to prove that stay-at-home moms produce more (not all!) solid citizens than career women.</p> |

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>Now, for the failures, there are usually reasons for that as well. Many parents are afraid of impressing their own value system too strongly upon their children. So, instead of supervising their kids, and keeping close watch on what they are doing for entertainment (music, television and movies) and who they are hanging out with for friends, they let the kids do what they want. That will negate much of the good of having a stay at home mom.</p> <p>Parenting is a tough job and even the best parents may get a bad apple that they can't do anything with. That is unfortunate when it happens but it does not negate the principle that caring, stay-at-home-moms, produce a much higher percentage of good kids. That is fact, not assumption.</p> <p>Hopefully, if you manage to stay alive long enough, you will outgrow these crazy adolescent years and the attitude you have right now, and you will come to your senses. Where there is life, there is hope.</p> <p>Thanks for signing my guest book. -Al-</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|---|--|
| 11/10/99 03:36:23 PM | |
| Name: | Simp |
| Do you consider yourself a feminist? | nope |
| Comments: | <p>You are doing a great job Al! I don't know where you get the patience to respond to some of these people that sign your guest book. They obviously don't even bother to read your articles before they think they know what you represent. They spout the same BS each time and don't even bother to learn the facts.</p> <p>I have been watching a trial on court tv. A female prosecutor has used her own discretion to try a 13 year old as an adult for a murder he allegedly committed when he was 11! The defense</p> |

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>attorney has shown that the prosecution doesn't even have enough evidence to prosecute him in the first place. During her closing argument she makes a statement to convince the jury that he is competent to stand trial. She sais that she left her 11 year old home by himself to take care of her 2 other children while she is at work! Not only does this feminist abandon her own children but she prosecutes 13 year olds and attempts to put them in prison for life.¹⁷³</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">One of my (adult) students listened to me answer, what could be safely categorized as a very stupid question, by another student for the umpteenth time. I answered it quietly and with respect, as I always do in my classes. He walked over to me a little later and said, "Al you are a very patient man." I try to treat all people with respect but I am human, and the intensely ignorant, or the intensely arrogant, sometimes generate more rudeness in me than I would like in myself, but even rudeness can at times be appropriate when a guest is rude themselves.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The subject of child criminals is a little beyond the topic of this web page, but the admission by the female lawyer that she is abandoning her children in order to pursue her career speaks loudly in support of the need for my web page and a thousand more just like it! Thanks for dropping by and signing my guest book!</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-A.I-</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| 11/10/99 09:52:08 PM | |
| Name: | R |
| Do you consider yourself a feminist? | no |
| Comments: | Okay, first of all, let me start by saying that |

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

your site did not anger me. I could even go as far to say it amused me. You proudly display pictures of women being dragged around by their hair and then spout out some phony line about women needing respect. I don't know about you but I'd feel quite disrespected if anyone, a man or a woman, decided to drag me around by my hair. Did you ever stop to consider that women are more than incubators? Personally, I do not feel ANY desire to have a child of my own. The world is overpopulated as it is without me selfishly bringing another life into it, while millions of unwanted children are born each year. Well, what I'm trying to say here is that you portray a very stereotypical view of women AND men. There are billions of each on this planet and there is no way to label them all. In order to make this world a better place let's stop blaming and scape-goating and start trying to cooperate.¹⁷⁴

You may find this hard to believe, but I would never even dream of dragging any woman around by her hair, even a feminist. If you click on the main picture of the little caveman, there is an explanation for the pictures. The caveman image has been around for a long time. The old story of a caveman clubbing his mate-to-be over the head and dragging her off to his cave predates you and me. It is a symbol of the masculine and feminine at its more basic level. The strong male and the submissive female, going off to live together for the rest of their lives. A symbol meant to laugh at, as you agree with what lies behind it.

Did you read a single word on my page? Apparently not, for if you did, and you have a reading comprehension over 10%, you would never ask if I thought that women were only incubators. That is a very important role that women have, for our entire species relies on that function, but nowhere on my page do you

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

find any indication that women are nothing but "incubators."

Your ignorance on the subject of reproduction is astounding. Your willingness to admit that you have no concern whatsoever for the future generations by contributing to them is candid if nothing else. One less child programmed by a feminist mind certainly has its advantages. However, your comment on the world population is just plain dumb. It is not selfish to reproduce yourself and maintain your nation. The people in the "first world" countries of this world are not, I repeat, ARE NOT contributing to the overpopulation of this world. I am sick to death of hearing that lie! Today in the United States, the native born citizens are not reproducing even at the replacement level! Virtually all our growth comes from immigration. That is a dangerous situation that must be faced. While the third world nations are busting at the seams with their overpopulation we are not even breaking even. Does the word "overwhelmed" mean anything to you? Probably not.

While liberals like you keep crying for cooperation, and understanding, they use all their political force to squash their opposition. That is not cooperation, that is war. Those who wish to live lives according to the traditional sexual roles are forced by law to modify their behavior to accommodate the liberal point of view. It is not enough to ask to be left alone for the liberal, he instead demands acceptance of his dogma and physical conformity to his religion of egalitarianism. The attempt at deception is so obvious that it is amazing that anyone listens to it for a moment. Liberals only wish to "understand" that which tears down traditional roles. They wish all to accept that which is contrary to traditional life, while doing all in their power to destroy traditional life for those who wish to practice it. The liberal defines "cooperation" as giving in to liberal demands. If you

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

stand for anything at all you are not cooperating, unless it is something liberal that you are standing for.

You are quite correct that with 6 billion on the planet there is a lot of room for variation. However, even with over 3 billion women on the planet, there is not one female good enough to play in the NBA. That is a fact that applies universally to women. Not one of those women can father a child. Another fact which cannot be ignored. Beyond the absolutes, we have the norms, the averages and the window of normality. Here we find that women, on average -- including the prohibitive majority of women, though not all of them -- are less aggressive than men are. They are more nurturing than men are. They are not as good at math and science as men are. They are better spellers, and find it easier to find the correct word in conversation than men do. There are many other items in this category. It is a fact of life that the average man and the average woman are not interchangeable in life. There is sanity and order in the ideas of male leadership and the female being family oriented. There is insanity and chaos built into the ideas of feminism because they severely go against the normal male and female tendencies.

Yes, there are macho lesbian females who wish that they could do all the things that men do. They are terribly angry that women have traditionally had different roles than men. In order to pacify them, our society has essentially outlawed what the majority of women wanted in life. Any company that promotes masculine leadership today can, and will be, sued for discrimination. That is what feminists call "cooperation" and "understanding". Anyone with an active brain will call it by its real name: tyranny.

-Al-

11/11/99 04:02:59 AM

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

| | |
|---|--|
| Name: | Paul |
| Do you consider yourself a feminist? | No way! |
| How did you find out about my site? | Been before |
| Where are you from? | Scotland |
| Comments: | <p>How's it going Al? I have been touring the web arguing with feminists on their webpages and all the ones I talk to either delete my entry's or spout off at me saying I am a fascist and that feminism has "liberated" women for hundreds of years! I assume this includes the period before women had the vote, before they could allow themselves to weaken the armed forces of the west, and most importantly before they could murder and/or abandon their children! I will continue to battle against the feminist lunacy. I also saw a notice at my university a few weeks back in which a company was advertising positions for new graduates. The only catch was that you had to be a woman to get any of the positions available! Is this "equality"? Or just political correct fascism in action?¹⁷⁵</p> <p>Hi Paul, welcome back! You must understand that to a feminist, giving a woman preferential treatment is called "equal opportunity." In fact if they could do away with men altogether they would feel that they finally had a "level playing field." If there is one thing that we should have learned by now, you gain absolutely nothing by appeasing liberals of any kind. The more you give them, the more they demand. It never will change. Sooner or later the folks on the right are going to have to grow</p> |

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

| | |
|--|---|
| | some backbone. Keep up the good work! -Al- |
|--|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| 11/11/99 07:25:59 AM | |
| Name: | Esmeralda |
| Do you consider yourself a feminist? | No |
| How did you find out about my site? | Word of mouth |
| Where are you from? | NY |
| Comments: | <p>This site doesn't make any sense. Many of your statements are erroneous , misinformed ,one sided. The whole site lacks research and depth. Everything is very superficial. You don't have anything to back up your statements other than your own personal opinion, which does not go very far. You also lack logic and you contradict yourself many times in your various articles. I was going to respond on the issues but I figured what's the point ? My advice to you is to be more tolerant and for Crying Out Loud ,EDUCATE YOURSELF , try to go past your little world and see what other people think and try to open your mind to other lifestyles a little bit. This site cries ignorance !¹⁷⁶</p> <p>It is amazing how consistent the feminists can be on certain things. They always hide behind name calling and insult when they can't find a substantial thing to support their deluded point of view. You gave a great summation line for your post, " I was going to respond on the issues but I figured what's the point?" The ultimate cop out. But what else can you expect from a feminist who claims she is not. Talk</p> |

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>about being erroneous, shallow, ambiguous, uninformed and superficial, your post has it all. Not one issue! Only whining and your personal reaction to the facts on my page.</p> <p>Perhaps if you could have put your haughty delusions of goddesshood aside for just a moment, you might have found an issue to show your ignorance on. But it is so much easier to have a hissy fit and think that it will be irrefutable. WRONG!</p> <p>BTW, I have educated myself, you should try it sometimes. It will open up whole new horizons to you. Even better still, you should try thinking for yourself instead of relying 100% on what "other people think." Of course if you don't have the confidence in your own mental ability to do so, keep on being a sheep. Whatever makes you happy.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-Al-</p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| 11/12/99 01:56:00 PM | |
| Name: | Judy |
| Do you consider yourself a feminist? | yes |
| Comments: | <p>One thing you seem to have forgotten is that women have brains. Yes, they are more nurturing and emotional, but many are also very, very smart. Like me. I've always done better than most of my male colleagues in school, and I am well-respected. It seems very immature of you to declare yourself better than everyone else, just because you think you are.¹⁷⁷</p> <p>I hope you don't break your arm patting yourself on the back so hard. Somehow with your "massive intellect" you managed fumble every point you tried to make.</p> <p>1. I never anywhere on my page said that women do not have brains or that some of them</p> |

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>are not very, very smart. My wife, for example is very intelligent, with an IQ above the average doctor.</p> <p>2. The fact that you can handle school work in no way runs counter to anything on my web page.</p> <p>3. Contrary to your assertion, no place on my page have I mentioned my own IQ, or said that I was better than anyone else.</p> <p>Thanks for dropping by and signing my guest book, for whatever reason you chose to. - Al-</p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| 11/12/99 06:16:18 PM | |
| Name: | David |
| Comments: | <p>Feminism is the belief that women have a right to choose what they want to do. You are misrepresenting it.¹⁷⁸</p> <p>It is nice of you to come, make your claims and leave. Unfortunately for you, what you said is in complete support of what I am saying, and proof that I am not misrepresenting feminism. You say that feminism claims women have the "right" to do whatever they want. (Naturally enough, you phrased it in the typical sloppy feminist fashion. Of course all people "choose what they want to do" it is only a question of whether they get to do what they want to do, which I assume is what you really meant, giving you the benefit of the doubt that you intended some meaning of consequence to what you stated.) No one has the right to do whatever they want to do. Since feminism demands that females be given the "right" of doing what they want, a situation is created that is destructive to society. To clarify my point, take these examples:</p> <p>1. I must go to work and earn a paycheck, when I would much rather be doing other things for my family and myself. Unfortunately, life imposes certain requirements upon</p> |

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

us all, regardless of our wants. -- Note that the law does not (and should not) move in to force society to pay me to sit at home and do what ever I want.

2. Children require a great deal from their parents. If you want to spend your time and money on other things, you are ethically required to not "do what you want" as feminism insists you can. -- Note that, unlike what the feminists claim, the law has no obligation, or moral grounds, to support you in your neglect of your children, or forcing others to take up your obligations for you while you choose to do what ever you want.

3. In order for you to be hired, you should present yourself as the most qualified candidate, who can take the position without inflicting serious change upon the working environment. -Note that , unlike the absurd position taken by the feminists, the government has no legitimate role in making that process one bit easier for you. No employer has any obligation to hire you, even if you WANT the job.

4. Children need a mother specifically in their younger years. That means a woman who does "what she wants" by having a career instead of giving the children what they need is harming those of the next generation. - Note that the society has no obligation to take up the role of "mother" for children. It certainly has no obligation, or even any justification, for assisting mothers in abandoning their children while pursuing a career.

5. Most psychiatrists agree that men naturally tend towards having many sexual partners. However, despite this want, nearly all experts agree that fidelity is better for society. So decent and civilized men must give up their natural wants in order to have a solid and happy marriage. -Note that men have no right to expect that the government will assist them with any difficulties that they encounter by following their wants, any more than a woman

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>should in following her wants.</p> <p>These are just a few items that show you that what you want is not necessarily your "right". Just because you wish to live like a king does not give you that right. Just because you want a job doesn't give you a right to that job. The most important right you have is the one taken away by the feminist movement: the right to be free of government influence, as much as possible, in your lives. The primary evil of feminism, is its use of the government to force those who would otherwise not accept it into pretending to accept it. For many, that is the equivalent of forcing a religion upon them which they do not believe in, and find repugnant.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-Al-</p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| 11/12/99 06:21:09 PM | |
| Name: | Judy (again) |
| Comments: | <p>Then why do you think it's wrong if they want to exercise their minds and get a job? By the way your condescending manner is really annoying, I will try not to sound that way when I speak to you. Raising children is rewarding, but not all women are predisposed to do it. If they will make bad mothers, why should they have children? I also disagree with your views on overpopulation. Everyone has the responsibility to keep the population growth from skyrocketing, do you realize how terrible a place the world will be when there is not enough living space and food for the people living on it?¹⁷⁹</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Frankly, I don't care if you are annoyed. You chose to come to my guest book and attack what you think I am saying. You then go on to tell me how very, very smart you are. Each point you made was erroneous. Now you are annoyed. If you don't like the conversation, don't let the door hit you on the backside on the</p> |

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

way out.

As I have said over and over and over again to the intellectually lazy feminists who come to my page, I never said that a woman could not get a job. I have said that there are many negative consequences to having women in the workplace. I have outlined them extensively on my web page and will not repeat myself here on that score. I have made an appeal to common sense and reason to show how destructive feminism has been to our society. But I have never called upon the government to ban women from the workplace. On the contrary I have called for the government to get out of the employment game completely. Where I am furious with feminism is where it has used the government to force companies to hire people based upon factors other than their personal qualifications, and the companies' desires. If a company chooses to not hire women, that is the company's choice not the feminists. Is that clear yet? I have made this point repeatedly but all you "very, very smart" women just can't seem to grasp it yet.

On a societal level, I don't care about bad mothers. Setting your norms based upon them is like basing your society upon one legged people, or mentally retarded people. Sure they exist but society must base its norms upon the normal person not the abnormal person. The normal woman will make at least an adequate mother, and she will be an exceptionally better mother than nearly any man could be.

There is nothing you can do to stop the population explosion, except perhaps to stop supporting organization like "Feed the Children." (Not a step that I would recommend by the way.) Right now, in America we are at a rate that is below the replacement level and still the world population is spinning out of control. While we are no longer having children, we are bringing in huge numbers of immigrants, and illegal aliens, (who come from countries where

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>birth rates are high AND WHO CONTINUE TO HAVE A HIGH BIRTH RATE ONCE THEY GET HERE) which has kept our population growth rate at a level at least as high as it ever was. (Notice how traffic and congestion continue to worsen in our cities, even though our birth rate is low. It will only get worse!) Your view is short-sighted and narrow. We could cut our birthrate to zero and you would still see the world population continue to go through the roof, but you would then lose all power to defend your own land, and it would be taken over by the ones who have not restricted their growth. (As you are already beginning to see today.) Guess what happens then? America will slide into the third world and have a population explosion to match anyway. You need to wake up and smell the coffee. Until you can find a way to control the birth rate of other lands, the US birth rate is completely insignificant to world population problems. Perhaps a better solution for our nation would be to direct our resources away from social programs and towards developing space as a frontier. Then population would be a problem no longer.</p> <p>At the very least, your personally having a small family today is nothing but a symbolic gesture that will merely contribute to the decay of the American civilization. -Al-</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|---|----------------|
| 11/19/99 04:16:31 PM | |
| Name: | Marissa |
| Website Title: | polished.org |
| Do you consider yourself a feminist? | Yes. |
| How did you find out about my | A sexism rant. |

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| site? | |
| Where are you from? | Indiana. |
| Comments: | <p>This is sad. In all sincerity, I pray the poor soul that actually thinks he has made any points with this some day takes a few steps out of the Neolithic Age.¹⁸⁰</p> <p>What is truly sad is what feminism has already done to this country, and even worse what it will do to the country in the future if we do not stop it soon.</p> <p>Take heart oh dreary soul, your wish was fulfilled before you even made it. What self-respecting resident of the Neolithic Age would cast aside his polished stone implements in favor of a keyboard?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-Al-</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| 11/20/99 03:05:07 AM | |
| Name: | Brooke |
| Do you consider yourself a feminist? | Not a superior one. |
| How did you find out about my site? | Someone posted about how much of an ass you are. |
| Comments: | <p>This is crap. If you had your brain, placed in a woman's body, with the choices she has, you would be singing a different tune. Especially seeing how one-sided you are. You think, "Wow, woman have totally different morals than we do, they can't even juggle a job and kids, THAT is the problem with society." You want to know what the problem is? Because of "woman oppression", we are just now learning the joys of having a job. Men may have gone through the war, done their duties, woman have stayed at home, done</p> |

their chores. There is a pyramid by someone (don't quite recall) and it talks about the 7 steps to self-actualization. One of them is "the quest for learning". We also have that thirst. I am just wondering if you realize that. As for another thing, you expect woman to be at fault for the child violence. You stated your point. I understand it. *puke* What I'd like to know is, how do you expect little girls to grow up "normal" with slutty bimbos on TV. Yuck¹⁸¹

It is ever the wish of the feminist to have the male brain in the female body. It is clear sign of how confused the proponents of this twisted philosophy are. As I have pointed out on numerous occasions, the male brain and the male body are irrevocably joined together. The male brain is part of the male body, and develops biologically as a male brain completely independently of the cultural inputs imposed upon it after birth.

Your statement about "morals" and juggling did not really make sense as it stands. Speaking to the first half of the statement, women have different natural tendencies than men have, in regards to sexual relationships. The experts are agreed that men are more focused on the physical side of such relationships and women on the emotional side. This leads to different wants and needs between men and women. It is part of what makes marriage such an interesting process. If you wish to call that "different morals," so be it.

The second half of the statement was essentially correct. However, to imply that not being able to handle two full time jobs at once is something which should be referred to as something that "they can't even" do, is like saying that a weight lifter who can bench press 450 pounds, cannot EVEN bench press 900 pounds. Rather absurd. The fact is that raising kids is more than something you can just "jug-

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

gle." It is a project that takes decades to complete. It takes all day every day.

The fact that women have abandoned their kids to day care centers, and when the children got older, left them to take care of themselves after school, is a major problem in our society today. It is A problem, not THE problem. On this web page I am focusing on the problems created by feminism, of course there are other forces at work in our society that work hand in hand with feminism to pull our society down.

The oppression of women? In our society? Women in the USA have been treated better than women anywhere, anytime. Women in the USA have not been oppressed at all. Women who have been all fired up to go out and drink in the "joys of having a job" have been able to do so all this century. The fact is that, before the 1960s feminist revolution, most women quit their jobs when they got married, by choice, and stayed at home to raise the children. They expected a man to support them, and they expected to have the right to raise their children. Those expectations and rights have been stolen by the feminists, without so much as a by your leave.

Funny you should remember that men have sacrificed their lives on the battlefield to protect their women. Interesting that you should remember that men have supported their families. Duty drove men to do these things. They are part of the responsibilities of being a man. What you forget is that women have responsibilities as well, and the foremost of these responsibilities is to reproduce the next generation, and see that the morals, and culture of the society are passed down to the future. They are the focus of the family, and if women do not do their job, families, and therefore the society, will collapse.

I wonder if you realize that no one, especially me, is denying women the opportunity to learn? Obviously not.

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>I do not "expect women to be at fault" for anything. I expect women to hold up their responsibilities, just like I expect men to hold up their responsibilities. Feminists, not women, are the root cause of many of the ills of society today. One of the ways that they have done their damage is by forcing women out of the home and into the workplace. That has left children unsupervised, where they spend a great deal of time watching slutty women on television, most of who are slutty working women by the way. When a mother is doing her job, little girls (or little boys) won't be watching television at all, but will be doing far more constructive things with her time.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-Al-</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| 11/26/99 06:21:17 PM | |
| Name: | Sarah |
| Comments: | <p>Plain and simple....you're an a__h___.¹⁸²</p> <p style="text-align: center;">This is the deep and thoughtful sort of response that so well identifies most feminists. Plain and simple, I am right and that makes you crazy.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-Al-</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| 11/28/99 01:50:02 PM | |
| Name: | Beth |
| Do you consider yourself a feminist? | sometimes |
| How did you find out about my site? | looking up info for an essay |
| Where are you from? | Oregon |
| Comments: | I know you're going to pick this apart with some stupid line about how women should be at home |

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

baking pies, but I truly don't agree with you. I think it's wonderful that you believe so strongly in something, but pick something other than feminism. You must have had a very bad experience with one sometime in your life. I apologize if that is the case, but you need to let it go. I really hope you're getting paid for doing this and it's not just for fun because GET A LIFE!! How would you like to tell your daughter that she has to cook, clean, and take care of the kids for the rest of her life even though she's brilliant and talented and can make something out of herself? That's what I got out of your website. I am truly sorry that there are people like you out there.¹⁸³

Beth,

Since feminism is one of the great destructive forces in our society, it would be quite negligent for me to "pick something other than feminism," to talk about. Of course I do not limit myself to feminism, it is only this one web page that is directed at the leftist feminist cause. If you saw your country falling into chaos because of some fanatical cause being supported by your federal government, perhaps you could turn your back and ignore it, but not I.

I have been married for 23 wonderful years and have raised two sons to adulthood. Lady I have a life and it is a good one! My wife, who agrees with what is on my web page, has a very happy life as well. So, as is the case with most feminists, you do not have a clue as to what you are speaking about.

I happen to think that brilliant and talented women make the best homemaker wives and mothers. Who can better home school a child? Who better to leave the little minds of the next generation with? One thing that I bet you never even thought of is that when all the brightest women have careers, only the dumb ones will be reproducing in quantity. That will lower the

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>average IQ of the entire nation, not that you probably care at bit about that, since you seem to care only about yourself. Go have your career, and forget about baking, cleaning, cooking and children. All of those things will be taken care of by your friendly Big Brother government I am sure.</p> <p>People like me are what made America in the first place. As you live off the fat of the land, selfishly forgetting about the future and taking care of yourself alone, try not to think about the harm you are doing to the future. I doubt it will strain you too much to do so.</p> <p>-Al-</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| 11/29/99 03:42:48 PM | |
| Name: | None of your business |
| Comments: | <p>I find your website to be very insulting. First of all, you said that you don't hate women, but then you've got that lovely picture of the cave dude with the big head dragging that girl around by her hair. I wouldn't let ANYONE, man or woman, drag me around by my hair. Second of all, don't assume that every single woman on the face of the earth would make a good mother. I know I would make a terrible mother. I would rather be dragged around by my hair than have to stay home and take care of little brats. There are LOTS of things that I am a LOT better at than being a homemaker.¹⁸⁴</p> <p>Dear Miss Business,</p> <p>So nice of you to drop by and share with us your personal shortcomings. I have no doubt that you would make a terrible wife and mother. That is neither surprising nor relevant. What you personally do, or are capable of doing, means nothing to society in general, since it has over 230 million people in it to counteract your limitations.</p> <p>What is important is the effects of having a</p> |

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

small group of lesbian led feminists, using the federal government to promote their personal opinion and desires, via propaganda, laws and court rulings, over the desires of the mainstream of America. Today, we are suffering the effects of having our children brainwashed for a generation and a half, with the feminist lies both in school and in the media. As a result divorce has become the norm and children no longer know what it means to have both of their real parents living at home with them throughout their childhood. As I pointed out on my web page the effect of this feminist phenomenon is to force children into single-mother households, where they are 20 times more likely to go to prison, 5 times more likely to commit suicide, 20 times more likely to have behavioral problems, 14 times more likely to become rapists, 32 times more likely to run-away, 10 times more likely to do drugs, 9 times more likely to drop out of high school, 33 more times likely to be seriously abused , 73 times more likely to be killed by abuse, one tenth as likely to get A's in school, and have a 72% lower standard of living. I know that to the typical feminist there is no chord of sympathy felt for such suffering by children, since these feminists are perfectly happy to slaughter their own children and have others slaughter their children in the womb. But there are many people in the USA who do still care about kids enough to provide a solid family situation for them, without the abuse of daycare or divorce. It is for those people that my web page exists, not for you.

If you would have clicked on my main logo you would have found out all about the little caveman and his woman. If you had browsed my guest book you would have found out that other feminists with no sense of humor have made the same mistake as you have. But education and understanding is not what feminism is all about. It is agenda, propaganda and totalitarianism.

-Al-

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

| | |
|---|--|
| 11/30/99 02:51:36 PM | |
| Name: | Hillari Hunter |
| Do you consider yourself a feminist? | Ever since I was a child. |
| How did you find out about my site? | Surfing the net. |
| Where are you from? | Chicago |
| Comments: | <p>The economy is not, or ever will, be booming for most folks, that's why most women work. You make a bad generalization when you think it's about women trying to be independent (which is not a bad thing), or wanting to buy more luxury items. Love alone is not providing clothes, food, and roof over the heads of the families of the married women I know; it's the extra (and essential) paycheck she brings home. Besides, my mother, a domestic abuse survivor, always told me to have my own money. Husband get ill and/or injured and can't work; husbands divorce their wives and ignore their kids; some husbands refuse to get and/or keep steady employment; husbands die. This is reality.¹⁸⁵</p> <p style="text-align: center;">The economy is booming quite well today. The problem is not that most families do not bring in enough money. The problem is that the government takes half of the money that is brought in. That is caused by the very ones who have brought you the feminist movement. The socialist who thinks that the government is our "Daddy" and must take care of us, telling us who we must hire and promote and where we will spend our charity dollars - as well as how many of our dollars will be given to the government charity system - is the very one</p> |

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

who claims that feminism is a just and worthy cause, and should be promoted by our government. If we returned to the free society that we had in the 1950s you would find that women in general, would once again have no reason to go to work to support their families.

For thousands of years husbands have gotten sick and died, or been crippled and unable to support their families. Somehow families managed to get along without feminism. Anyway, feminism has done little to fix that problem! In fact there are more kids abused and abandoned than ever before in our society thanks to feminism. The divorce problem has been multiplied many times over because of the feminist movement. You cannot use divorce to justify the promotion of feminism! That would be like killing your parents and then asking for mercy because you are an orphan! Feminism caused the problem and will never be the solution for it.

Abuse often causes phobias and the phobia against dependence for women is growing larger every day. Why? Because more women are abused and abandoned than ever before! Why? Because feminism has opened the door to it! Women, it is said, can take care of themselves, so a man that abandons his wife is not doing anything seriously wrong is he? If a woman were helpless and dependant, it would be criminally negligent to abandon her, but not now. So, men cut and run today when things get tough in a relationship, because they can. The insanity of the feminist apologist is such that divorce is used to justify more feminism, when feminism only causes more divorces.

Women who "have their own money" are still suffering from want because they end up raising kids alone. That takes all of their time and money, and they are left with, little money, frazzled nerves, and unruly children. You may

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

| | |
|--|---|
| | call that an improvement but I call it a disaster.* |
|--|---|

-Al-

CHAUVINIST CORNER GUEST REGISTRATION – 1999-2000

Name: Caveman Al

Website: The Chauvinist Corner

Referred by: From a Friend

From:

Time: 1999-12-01 15:04:00

Comments: To see the previous entries please¹⁸⁶

Name: Paul

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfed On In

From:

Time: 1999-12-02 03:10:00

Comments: Hi again Al. I just wanted to tell you about a case over here in the U.K. regarding feminist values. Maybe you saw it in the U.S.? Anyway, a female lawyer had two baby sons a couple of years apart. Both died of cot death. But it was later found that the mother had smothered the children to death, because she did not want them to "get in the way of her career"! I have yet to see the feminist groups on the news campaigning for her freedom, since of course by their thinking she has the "right" to do such things. A feminist who runs a webpage recently told me that "recent evidence indicates that the differences between men and woman are caused by society rather than nature"! Surely no-one could believe such an obvious nonsense? See you later, Paul.¹⁸⁷

It is amazing that the hypocritical media even mentioned the story. This is quintessential feminism: kill the kids so you don't have your career held back. That is what abortion is all about. This the very same process at work. While feminists

* NOTE: It appears that Hillari has decided to make this her own private forum rather than a Guestbook. So I have created a separate annex of her entries to avoid the clutter here. If you wish to follow along with her posts [Click Here](#)

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

may be too frightened to come out directly in support of this murderess, you know they sympathize with her completely.

Oh, there are a great many brainwashed, fanatical feminists who actually believe that all the differences between men and women are because of the way they are raised. I have these mental defectives visit my page from time to time. They ignore their own experience, and every study that has ever been done on children's behavior, and just assume the world is the way that they wish it was. The Book Brain Sex is filled with evidence beyond debate. Girl babies immediately react to people and things differently than boy babies do. This is before any outside pressures have been applied. From then on the differences only become more obvious, with the chasm climatically widened beyond any possible confusion at puberty. Societal views about men and women came from biology. Biology forced society to act as it does, society did not force males and females to act the way they do, in the area of basic sexual differences.

While this is a settled matter scientifically, politically the feminist does not care about objective reality at all. She will continue to pursue her political agenda regardless of scientific fact, or the destructive results of her activities. If it takes killing all women, the feminist will be happy to do it, as long as all of the women died for the feminist cause.

Thanks for dropping by again,

-Al-

Name: Rhonda

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Austin tx

Time: 1999-12-05 19:31:00

Comments: I agree with you in lots of ways. I believe in God and the bible...and I personally think that women should be able to do anything they want in the way of careers and w/their lives. If they want to be a corp executive making lots of money more power to them! But ...one of the things God put women in this earth to do was to be mommy's. If you have a baby you should do everything you can to stay at home and raise that child, and you're right....there's no one at home these days to watch the children..make sure they have morales...care about the child's welfare....to make that child feel loved. So I agree w/that part. My mom stayed at home w/me ,until

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

we were old enough for school anyway, and my parents made many sacrifices. You dont have to have the 2nd car ,biggest home etc..... I do disagree w/you on voting!!! While women do rule w/emotions I believe we are smart enough to make the right choice in how we vote. We have a right to have a say so in who's running our country because we live in it. We are citizens. What happens here affects us. We have to know whats going on,we cant just sit back meekly and be told how to live and what to do. Whats next....if this abolish 19th amendment gets passed? Will you then say we shouldnt be citizens?¹⁸⁸

Rhonda,

If you are saying that women have the right to try on their own to do whatever they want, I agree with you. If you are saying that the government should be assisting that pursuit in anyway, through laws, state financed programs, or court rulings, we are in complete disagreement. Therein lies the disaster that feminism holds in its hands. The absurdity of feminists is beyond ludicrous. You just have to laugh at them to keep from crying. The idea that men would be afraid of equal competition from women is too funny for words. Where men are upset by feminism is exclusively because of the federal government putting lethal pressure on companies to play the feminist game, by the feminist rules. Without that pressure, feminism would have died the miserable death that it deserves.

The facts are there for anyone to see. As women have taken over our democracy, being in the majority, we have moved quickly to the political Left. It will destroy our freedom, our society, our culture and our people. The sad thing is that women are the ones who are going to suffer the most when our standard of living falls down to levels that the Soviet Union considered normal for most of its existence. That is what the female vote has done for us this century. You and all other women are going to pay the highest price for that mistake.

For most of the history of the United States, women did not have the vote. Women were still citizens and protected under the law. So, your assertion that I am trying to take your citizenship away is completely groundless. The vote has done nothing to help the majority of women and has done much to harm them. You will see that harm increase greatly in the fu-

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

ture. The Western democracies have treated women better than any other society in the history of mankind. By the female vote turning those societies into socialistic entities, the high standard of living that was possible before will fall away, and what will be left is a dreary life for all, especially women. "Women and children first" will be replaced with "every man for himself." You will not like it.

-Al-

Name: Sylvie

Website:

Referred by: From a Friend

From: Canada

Time: 1999-12-05 19:36:00

Comments: I am a 40 years old mother who was an full time homemaker not totally by choice but to please my husband who is a "chauvinist". Since I got married, I never worked outside the home and I did all the cleaning and the cooking for my husband and family. Now I realize that I did this not because that makes me happy but because I was raised to please people around me. Of course, young kids need their mother at home most time and parenting is a big responsibility. But why a mother should do ALL the housework? And don't forget that kids grow up and it comes a time when a mother can think about her carrier. My children are 16 and 18 years old so they don't need me at home all day long. But I still feel responsible for all the care taking and the housework because of the pressure around me. While I don't agree with all the feminists ideas, I know that they are the ones who will support me the most right now. There is certainly not a chauvinist who will try to understand my frustrations, even not my husband. I have a wonderful daughter and a wonderful son but this is not because I am at home all day every day. Some working women have wonderful children and can be good mother too. Of course my husband is happy to have me at home because he has no (or almost no) cleaning or cooking to do, but how can it be that good for myself, the family or the society? This is not to say that all I did was useless and that my husband is a bad man, but I think that I would feel better if I had a life outside the home and if I had more support for that. I know that chauvinists will never understand my point of view and they are happy to not having another "carrier woman" around them, but at least I can share my

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

opinions in a chauvinist's guestbook. Don't be angry if I don't show your webpage to my husband, I don't want to reinforce his chauvinist views :)¹⁸⁹

You have two children at home and you don't have them helping you with the housework? What have you been teaching your kids all these years? My sons certainly helped my wife out with the housework while they were home, and when they left the housework became proportionally that much less.

Labor will have to be divided up some way in a household. In my household, I earn the money and my wife spends it. It works out well for us. One thing that I never do is take my wife's efforts for granted. I think many husbands do and that can turn a happy task into pure drudgery. I literally thank my wife several times a day for all the things that she does for me. It is not just a pat routine, or a meaningless "thank you" either. She knows that all her efforts are appreciated. And she lets me know that the work I do for the family is appreciated as well. It is a joint effort. Equally important roles but different roles.

I do think that most women do not know how much men chafe in their roles. Most men tend to keep their problems to themselves. There is always some pain in obligation. For women supervising kids can be thankless work, but it is nearly always rewarded at some point in your life.

Feminists could not care less about you. You are merely a pawn in their power struggle. If they thought killing you would further their cause they would neither hesitate to do it, nor lose one second's sleep over having done it. It is clear that rape is only an issue if it furthers their agenda. Otherwise they are completely unconcerned about it. On every issue that they speak to, you will find that they are only interested in how that issue will increase their political power. They are perfectly willing to draft women into the military (proven by their attempts to do just that) when they know that most women are unwilling, unfit and will be killed, raped and abused in huge numbers. They do not care about what happens to women. It is power and nothing else that they are focused on.

You don't have to show your husband my web page, he sounds like he has his priorities right already. However if you think he is not appreciative enough have him read Women,

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

the Foundation of Civilization. I certainly do not claim that all chauvinists are the best they can be. Traditional marriage is something that you have to work at. Where feminism failed was when it chose to focus on pulling down the traditional family instead of trying to focus on improving the efforts of both sexes in making traditional marriage work better.

My wife and I were waiting in line the other day, at a store, and the clerk asked us, "Are you newly weds?" After 23 years of marriage that is still the way we strike people. If a marriage is done right, there is nothing better on earth. Of course the converse can be just as true. A bad marriage can be hell. That is why our society should be focusing on making good marriages, instead of bad ones.

-Al-

Name: Shelly

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfed On In

From: a rich neighborhood

Time: 1999-12-09 14:08:00

Comments: I just thought I should tell you what losers you are. Don't get me wrong- I love to date chauvanists, because they are so easily manipulated They think I am weak and incapable opening my own car doors ect. They act like servants and buy me presents whenever I cry. Best of all, they don't think I am capable of arguing or having rational discussions, so I get to bilk money out of them without even listening to their stupid opinions. Hey, its your call- If you think women are sex objects and supporting nuturing types, then vixens like me will think you are nothing more than bank accounts and pay chaks. Plus, there are plenty of young pretty girls just like me, and we could not care less about emotionally supporting anyone but ourselves. You guys think you're tough and manly- Yeah Right! You guys are just afraid of women.¹⁹⁰

Thanks for the laugh. Me a loser? You don't have a clue. I have been happily married for over 23 years and my wife is my best friend. I open her door for her and she likes it. It is a sign of respect for her, not because she can't do it herself but because I want to do it for her. The thing is, unlike leaches like yourself, a good woman not only receives special attention but she gives it. Marriage is a two-way street, and all you

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

one-way type people crash and burn at some point in your lives. What goes around, comes around.

The prostitute has always been out there to sell sex for favors, and if that is what you wish to be that is no skin off my nose. While there will always be women like you, as well as the men who are just as morally bankrupt to use women, that means nothing to society in general. You see, to offset your self-centered damage are all the wonderful women who really do care about their husbands and their children. These women are the backbone of society, something someone like yourself would never understand.

-Al-

Name: Lynda

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 1999-12-10 22:13:00

Comments: Why do female athletes upset you so much? So what if they are second rate? So are kids on little league, and people in events such as the special olympics. Sports is not simply an issue of physical ability. Discipline, dedication and enthusiasm also contribute to the value and enjoyment of sports. I'm sure you'll agree that women can be equal to men in these concepts. Plus, any one with common sense knows that women want to compete with each other even if they do not want to compete with men. Even in very patriarchal societies such as ancient Greece, women competed against each other in their own sporting events. In addition, I personally have always thought women bring a bit of grace and aesthetic value to sports. So, If you have something against women in sports, then don't watch them.¹⁹¹

Nowhere on my page did I say that women should be restricted from playing sports or with playing with dolls or playing with anything else that strikes their fancy, in the area of entertainment. Your implication that I did is totally unfounded. My only objection to female athletes is when the feminists try and claim that they are the equal of male athletes.

I agree with you completely that Little League is great entertainment. So are the Special Olympics. Also, I enjoy

watching females run around in skimpy sporting outfits as much as any man does. Very entertaining. Kids or women playing sports and having a good time is just fine. Nothing on my page says otherwise.

I will not grant you that women are the equal to men in enthusiasm for sports, at least competitive sports. It is no coincidence that female professional sports are over loaded with lesbians. That unnatural masculine orientation of the brain is what supplies them the competitive drive that they have. Girls of course can be competitive, but males are more competitive. Playing hurt, and playing past the point where you know you are going to be hurt is very common among even average male athletes. Winning is more important than it has any real right to be with most males. My wife often says that she just doesn't understand the male drive to win. She wants to win, but having fun is what really counts to her. That is the normal feminine approach to sports.

Professional sports are just a matter of physical ability, at least as the baseline starting point. If you do not have the physical ability, you cannot play the sport no matter what other attributes you may have. That is why women will never be good enough to play real professional sports. Here is where we run into difficulty.

The feminists want to force schools to spend as much money on female athletic programs as male athletic programs. That is absurd, because females on average, do not participate in sports as often or as enthusiastically as males do. Also, at the schools where they sell tickets for sports, usually the male sports draw in more fans because the level of play is superior. Therefore the feminists are acting in a less than fair (big surprise!) or intelligent (another real shocker!) manner .

In the Olympics it is completely absurd to count women's medals as equal to men's for the same event. If women want to take home a gold medal for the 400 meter run, they should have to run the fastest time in that event. Otherwise it is like having a gold medal in a Special Olympics event being counted as equal with a gold medal for the best men's time. You know that this is true and that saying that does not in any way deprive women from playing all the sports their little hearts desire. It is the prestige of being equal, without being equal that feminists want and that is what I am against. The Greeks understood this. They had a completely separate

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

competition for women. It had nothing to do with the men's Olympics. I don't know why feminists are so much less intelligent than the Greeks were.

Women do bring grace to all that they do. That is why watching women's tennis, with the short little skirts, is so popular. Female ice skating is also very graceful and fun to watch. (And you have to love those outfits!) It is like watching dance or some other graceful activity. I certainly don't have any problem with that, and nothing on my page says that I do. It is only when feminists are trying to equate male sporting ability with female sporting ability that I do have a problem with it.

-Al-

Name: Jesse

Website:

Referred by: Lycos

From:

Time: 1999-12-14 14:37:00

Comments: Wow, I am suprised you crawled out of your cave to make this website. Bah, people like you are still arguing over who belongs where, who is subserviant to who. My mother worked while my father changed my soiled diapers on the bathroom floor because McDonald's was not equiped with proper changing facilities in the Men's room at the time. My aunt has three kids and stays at home while my uncle is a trucker. We're both happy families. What does it matter who does what, as long has you're happy?¹⁹²

There must be a cloning device out there somewhere, that is producing exact replicas of liberals. They all sound the same.

Perhaps someone like you would not care to notice but there are far more children today who are left in their dirty diapers, or are being changed by short tempered strangers who are far more like to be abusive to those crying babies, because of what mothers choose to do. (If you had the opportunity to check, you would find that most men's restrooms still don't have changing facilities today, and I can't remember ever seeing one of those men's room baby changing stations actually in use my entire life.)

Personal happiness first of all is not the only important thing in life. Secondly, immediate personal happiness, may

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

actually lead to long term misery. Hedonism may be a lot of fun. It may generate tremendous personal happiness in the short term. Many folks jump into an adulterous affair because they are looking for personal happiness. Are they happy? For the short term, I am sure that they are. But in the long term, it can lead to great misery in the form of divorce, or even death, if a jealous spouse finds out. Happiness is transient, and can only be properly evaluated at the end of one's life, when that which has remained will have been separated from that which was only temporary .

My web page is not about any one family. It is about a movement. This movement has ripped our families apart, and left our children without their fathers, or much of their mothers. This movement has led us into socialistic ideas and it is assisting the government in stealing the rights and power of the individual citizen for itself. This has led to oppression of both men and women, and will only lead to more of the same in the future. This process must be stopped, and therefore the feminist movement must be opposed and stopped. If that surprises you, it is time you wake up to what is going on, so as not to be more unpleasantly surprised by events in the future.

-Al-

Name: Elisabeth

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfing On In

From:

Time: 1999-12-14 18:48:00

Comments: I think you are basing your whole page on the fact that YOUR marriage works wonders that way and that YOU and YOUR wife are happy the way that YOU guys do things. What you seem to leave out, in my opinion, is that everyone is different, has different goals, ambitions, purposes, etc... While this pattern of life has been successful for you and your family, it may not be the same for other families. I am 45, I am a business owner. I own my own restaurant and I have worked very hard at that. I have always worked even though my husband was making good money and I didn't HAVE to work. I wanted to. I was a restaurant manager for years and after gaining enough experience, I opened my own place which is now very successful. I also have 2 children. They are both very smart, well adjusted young adults. My son is 22 and has been with the same

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

girlfriend since he was 16. He is graduating college this year. My daughter is 17, and off to college next year. She is a brilliant student and has been awarded a scholarship. My children have never ever been neglected nor did they ever feel that way. My husband and I celebrated our 25th anniversary last October and we are still like newlyweds. I think every family does what works for them and it shouldn't be anyone else's business what they do and the way they choose to live their lives. As long as everybody is happy and well adjusted, it's a success!¹⁹³

As with most feminists, you think wrongly. I do not base my page upon only my own marriage, or even mostly upon my own marriage. My own marriage merely makes a clear example of how great a traditional marriage can be. There were millions of such marriages before the 1960s Liberal invasion of this country, and the fact is that the vast majority of those marriages held together! Divorce was the exception not the rule. It is not just the way we do things, or what makes us happy, that is important. What is important, is what makes marriages last, and thereby protects children, and also what prepares the next generation for perpetuating our society, and culture.

The self-centeredness of the feminist is absolutely the defining attribute of the movement. What makes you happy is all that counts. To hell with your children, your husband, the society, your culture, the future of all your descendants. Only worry about what makes YOU happy.

What built the USA was a huge majority of the population who thought of others. They worried about creating strong families before worrying about what made themselves happy. They worried about their own children and their spouses more than their own self-fulfillment. They worked hard, and gave much, and in return they had solid families that lasted for life. They had neighborhoods that were crime free. They had honor and they gave to charity even when they had far less money than people do today. Those people built America, and the Left is doing all that it can to tear it down.

There are examples of children who have lived through having two alcoholic parents. (Often these parents remained married for life, call them a success if you like.) These children had to fend for themselves most of their lives, and many have grown up to be "well-adjusted," and "very smart," even

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

"brilliant". They have won scholarships. They have even gone on to have alcohol free lives, and permanent marriages. Does that make a case for being an alcoholic parent, as a positive or even an acceptable thing? Only to someone who was enamoured with the idea of promoting alcoholism. It is just what you are trying to do with your example for feminism.

I will take you at your word that you have been a restaurant manager for your 25 year marriage. It follows therefore that you had absolutely nothing to do with raising your children. I have known several people in the restaurant business, and it is one of the most time consuming jobs there is, more like having two fulltime jobs. In order to do that you had to abandon your children completely to somebody else. Perhaps your replacement was an adequate substitute for a mother, or perhaps your kids just grew up young, and learned to fend for themselves, like the children of alcoholic parents have to. No matter how they managed to replace you, it does not in any way make a case for the neglect that you are guilty of in not being there for your children. However, you are happy, personally fulfilled, and since your kids managed to avoid joining the huge numbers of children who have had their lives completely destroyed by self-focused women like you, you feel justified in your selfish behavior.

Since, because of your demanding job, you have not seen your husband for 25 years, no doubt you feel like strangers more than newlyweds. Look at the millions of marriages that are ending in divorce because of feminism. The vast majority of marriages of today end up in that category. I recently read that over 80% of our kids are living in homes without both of their real parents present. That is as a direct result of feminism. That completely trumps your attitude that it doesn't matter what people do, as long as they are happy. When 80% of our children are impacted by a movement's distorted ideals, then it does matter, and it matters a great deal!

-Al-

Name: Observer

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfed On In

From: Space/Time constraints dont apply

Time: 1999-12-15 06:07:00

Comments: I can see having a site like this is loads of fun. I wish I had enough time/motivation to have one like this. Just remember the

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

more extreme and spectacularly unopposed a trend the sooner it starts to plant the seeds of its own destruction. Believe me, if you can feel, the seeds of destruction of this trend have already been planted, and by no one else but women themselves. You just enjoy your site. It is hardly needed, though. Regards, Observer.¹⁹⁴

While I agree with you that feminism is inherently doomed, because biology cannot be ignored, and the excesses of the feminist movement have made it appear ridiculous to any objective observer, there remains the problem of the government interference in our lives, in support of the hopelessly flawed feminist ideals. Our government has continued to grow this century, taking evermore power from the people, unto itself. It grows fat and oppressive. It looks for causes like feminism to use as an excuse to grow even more powerful and to justify even more oppression. All the while the feminists prance around and think that they are winning something for themselves, while they are merely the dupes of the Leftist power brokers. My page is needed, and a thousand more like it. Somehow Americans have to be awakened to the fact that their freedom is evaporating before their very eyes, and they better do something about it soon!

Thanks for dropping by.

-Al-

Name: SEXPLOYTATION

Website: SEXPLOYTATION

Referred by: Just Surfed On In

From:

Time: 1999-12-16 13:19:00

Comments: Hey Al, here's a book you and your readers might find interesting...

SEXPLOYTATION

ISBN-0966963903

April House Publishing

By Matthew Fitzgerald

<http://www.sexploy.com>

<http://www.amazon.com>

e-mail feedback@sexploy.com

Excerpt From Chapter Three "The Failure Of Feminism"

"F" IS FOR FAILURE

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

Feminism is a failed social movement because it perverts nature. It fails to understand that men and women are intrinsically different, both physically and mentally. Warped by hate and greed, women are the sorriest kind of short-term thinkers. Like a spider spinning a web in a sealed tomb, they are oblivious to any reality wider than the scope of their self-focused egos and glandular "logic". Like spoiled brats, women demand privileges which, once granted, they come to expect as rights and always cry for more. The feminist movement is more characterized by overindulgent self-pity than heroics.

Feminism is a blueprint for deceit and despair, for a beleaguered present and a barren future. It rankles women to confront the truth about gender equity face to face: that equality means equality, and nothing less. You cannot have your cake and eat it, too. True equality means being slaughtered on the front lines; it means paying a fair share in dating and marriage; it means back-breaking hours at the office to earn a "man's salary". To compete for an equal paycheck a woman must have intelligence, drive, and ambition, not just a pair of breasts; to earn 20% more she must work 20% harder, as men have to do. All of this quarrels with the ease of traditional female whoredom. And so women blame men because now they are paying the price of the male worker: 60 or 70 soul-killing hours a week at a job which smothers them; interminable rush-hour commutes; jaw-clenching stress; ulcers and heart disease and early death; non-involvement in family life; divorce; and no time for "communicating". Suddenly women are opening their eyes and realizing that Lucy Ricardo and June Cleaver and Laura Petrie had the world literally by the balls-a little housekeeping and occasional sex for a life of comfort in the suburbs, spinning away the afternoons playing bridge or gossiping with the neighbors, while their husbands slaved at the office and worried about the bills.

But women were determined to make it in a "man's world". The feminists had brainwashed them and sold them a bill of goods. Their journey has led them on a circular path, like a dog chasing its own tail, from awareness to protest to victory to unvarnished reality. The fist clenched in righteous indignation of the early struggle has transformed itself into an accusatory finger shaking with rage. Women have found out-the hard way-that the "man's world" is hard work, and they don't like it a bit. "Liberation" has come to mean slogging home alone from a power-bitch job and falling asleep in front of the

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

television set, just like their fathers did. Only now there's no one there to scream at them for more money or more attention. The jailers have become the jailed.

Slowly women are beginning to brush away the wool the feminists have pulled over their eyes. What women are looking for now is a way out of the prison their greed and self-indulgence has built for them. What they want is the cozy life their mothers led. They are tired of working and want to be taken care of again. You've come a long way, baby, only to arrive back at the starting point, but it's too late. By usurping men's jobs, by blatantly stealing men's money, by arrogantly abusing their sexual power, women have killed the goose that lays the golden eggs. Disgusted by female behavior, men are finally wising up. A backlash is coming which will shake society to its foundations. The winners will be men, who will finally be free of the shackles of female domination. Women will be the losers, casualties in a senseless war they waged against nature itself.¹⁹⁵

It sounds like an interesting read. Thanks for sharing it with us.

-Al-

Name: Thinker

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 1999-12-19 02:28:00

Comments: Dearest Al, I consider myself a feminist by 60s definition and not feminist at all by 90s definition. I do believe some counter argument to today's radical-feminism is needed, but I also believe this shouldn't transmute into a movement of hatred. I don't know if you will agree but a female of a specie is always more precious than the male. We men make love to women (which is essentially fun for us)then leave them with a mammoth of a task for months, then a painful delivery, then breast feeding and what not. How can it ever reasonably be argued that a woman's life (even now when lots of laws in western countries favour them to some degree) is easier than that of a man? And any real (and in some cases I admit unfair) advantages that women have acquired they have only ac-

quired in the last few decades, and that too only in certain parts of the world. I doubt if we still have any real reason to complain. Also it seems highly unlikely that women will be able to continue indefinitely this trend. The 'feminization' of men that they insist on (the same new-age, sensitive, weeping, vulnerable man routine) has already triggered a chain of events which will soon make men see themselves as weak, oppressed gender hence the destruction of today's gender-feminism.¹⁹⁶

Well Mr. Thinker, we have some points of agreement and some of disagreement. In the agreement category, we are in accord on the fact that the female of the species is precious. In fact there is no debating that the female is the most important component of any species, but that is only true because she bears young. Take that away and she is far less. So, for a mother, she is indisputably the most precious of our species. This is what my page is all about. The fact is that a human child is not born, ready to go. It is not going to be finished with its need of a mother until it is an adult. (Even then a mother is a very important thing to an adult child.) Since a woman's special worth is in her role as mother, it is there that we should entice her to be, where we can focus upon her our attentions, adoration and special praise, not in the workplace where she makes a second rate worker bee.

Also in the agreement column, we are agreed that this façade of feminism cannot last. It is contrary to the biological reality of mankind and will therefore self-destruct at some point in the future. The only thing that has allowed it to progress this far is the iron fist of the government forcing Americans to accept feminist ideas against their will. Once we are rid of that, feminism as we know it will evaporate into the thin air from whence it came. That by the way is not hate, it is reality and nothing more.

In the column of disagreement, we find that our view of the roles of the sexes is not meshing. It is important, for the perpetuation of the species that men start the process off. So, they are naturally driven to do that, sometimes to the exclusion of nearly everything else. It is fun but necessary, which is no doubt why it biologically came to become fun in the first place. Where our views diverge is what the female goes through. A normal female is flushed with excitement when she finds out that she is pregnant. When she is in a good mar-

riage, her husband is excited with and for her. He dotes on her, and follows the progress of the baby's development with her. She shares with her friends her joy and they all discuss the process with her. It is a social event that females all share with each other. It is what she is on earth for, and she knows it. It is instinctual. It is fulfillment that a job could never come close to supplying. There is all sorts of primping and preening that goes on, and a baby shower to top it all off near the end. When that painful delivery is over, she brings home a little child that every woman, friend or stranger, will fawn over and make a fuss about how cute it is. Again it is a social event and as basic as breathing.

Where you error is thinking of women as being men. They are not. They do not view life through the same eyes. They do not have the same needs and desires. The book *Men are from Mars and Women are from Venus* is a very interesting study in the different ways that the sexes view life. For a man, pregnancy would be hell, for a normal woman it is at the root of her life's instinctual ambition. For a man, children are little bits of chaos that need to be whipped into shape. For a woman they are little darlings that can do little real wrong. (Of course there are moments even for a mother where children are a real pain, but not in the same way that they would be to a man.)

Since men and women live different lives no matter what they do, (even career women are fundamentally different than career men) there is no way to say who has an "easier" life. If a man loves to do work that is very physical, it is "easier" for him to do hard manual labor than to sit quietly behind a desk all day. The man behind the desk may enjoy that work and so it is "easier" to him than hard manual labor would be. What is "easier" is that which you are good at and that which you enjoy. So, the fact is that many women, who stay at home with their children and are supported by their husbands, have an easier life than many men, even though these women may work many more hours doing their job. Some men love what they do for work and they may have it "easier" than a woman who is a single mother and working a job she hates. Who has an "easier" life is the one who is happy, and that is the simple fact. You cannot judge a woman's happiness by what would make a man happy because on average it is not the same thing at all. In the end, it is not who has the "easiest" life that

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

is truly important but who has fulfilled their duty to the next generation, by first producing it, and then raising it.

Thanks for dropping in and sharing your thoughts.

-Al-

Name: Jim

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfed On In

From:

Time: 1999-12-21 16:31:00

Comments: My dear Al, Though I may not agree with every single thing you say (which is to be expected) I admire your honest and forceful no-apologies-offered style. Your responses in the guestbook have depth and the weight of reasoning behind. Must say you know what the hell you are talking about (however unfashionable that may be). By the way, sometime ago I remember watching one of those American talk shows which are so politically correct they transform into one pathetic lie. In that particular show a guest was speaking against the excesses of modern feminism in your own no-apologies-offered style. The scared (for his job and career) host had to bring every last ounce of his celebrity weight (along with the moral support of the booing pro-feminist crowd) against him to neutralise his presence. Just wondering was that you by any chance? Also, I am interested in visiting your other sites. Please supply the URLs in your reply. Cheers-Jim.¹⁹⁷

Thanks for dropping in and for your kind words. I have not been on any talk shows, so that was someone else that you saw. The last talk show that I used to watch regularly was Phil Donahue before Oprah hit the air. It finally dawned on me that there was nothing to be gained by watching those shows. They loaded up the audience with liberals, with just a handful of conservatives thrown in to laugh at. If they had a guest who was not PC, they usually would have a very PC guest on at the same time to "balance" the show. No balance was needed for the leftist guests of course, when they were promoting their books, etc. Any serious discussion that started to go in a direction that made the conservative point of view look good was terminated with a lying promise that the point being made would be gotten straight back to after the break. It never happened. The net effect of all television talk

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

shows is to push the audience towards the left, always. Even the mislabeled Politically Incorrect show was hosted by a self-proclaimed liberal. How can that be Politically Incorrect?

I watched one guy who came on the Donahue show who did it right. He was talking on the subject of homosexuality, and how he was against the lifestyle. Instead of trying to make a logical case against the deck, that Donahue always stacked against anyone from the right, he came out in a silly costume, that included rubber gloves and other protective clothing that visually got the point across that male homosexuality was a very unclean and medically dangerous lifestyle. I still remember the show, and I'll bet there are others out there who do as well. He specifically stated that there was no way that Donahue would allow an individual with traditional views to actually state his case and make any points, so he was making his point in other ways. Even still, I think the net result was not to make a great deal of ground with the viewing audience, but it did highlight the absurdity of watching talk shows to "educate" yourself about any topic.

My other web pages are on a different, and also politically incorrect topic. This page is dedicated to my wife and so I keep the two topics separate, to avoid distracting from the message here. If you wish to visit my other pages, email me with your request and I will send you the URL to my main page on the topic.

Cheers -Al-

Name: John

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:**Time:** 1999-12-28 04:28:00

Comments: Speaking of political correctness, other day I read with interest that they are making it illegal for cab drivers in New York to refuse Black passengers. Now I have nothing against Blacks (I'm not even white) but it is a F-A-C-T that the crime rate among Blacks in New York is muuuuuuuucccccchhhhhh higher than any other group, and I can fully understand if at times some cab drivers want to avoid black "passengers". Imagine the predicament of the driver who is stopped by three half-inebriated black men in the middle of the night. Now, laws like this are not just preposterous but down right unfair and dangerous. Frankly, if I were a cab driver in

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

NY I would seriously be considering giving up my profession. What surprises the wits out of me is what has happened to these lawmaking folks. I mean is there any room for truth and reason anymore? Or is everything now based on fashion, impression or what 'feels' right? I know racial issues is not even the topic of this page but political correctness is hence the post.¹⁹⁸

Our law makers have lost their credibility, their honor and their minds.

-Al-

Name: Feminazi (just kidding)

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfing On In

From:

Time: 2000-01-01 17:55:00

Comments: If possible, how do I get to the rest of your guestbook?¹⁹⁹

If you go to the bottom of this page you will find two buttons, one labeled "OLDER ENTRIES" and the other labeled "NEWER ENTRIES". Click on the "OLDER ENTRIES" button. That will take you to the first few entries. Go to entry #1 and click on the link there to move to the rest of my guest book.

-Al-

Name: Dale Summers

Website: Summers' Place

Referred by: Just Surfing On In

From: Atlanta, Ga.

Time: 2000-01-05 19:12:00

Comments: I really enjoyed your writings. I guess we agree on most subjects except abortion. We are 180 apart there.²⁰⁰

Well, I am glad that we agree on so much.

However, since you chose to bring up a point of disagreement, that is what I will discuss. It troubles me that the act of killing babies, as an accepted medical practice, could even be considered something to be seriously discussed, let alone actually be supported (and performed!) by otherwise

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

civilized adults. My article on abortion was directed to the single point that is quite focused, and in my opinion, is totally unassailable from logical attack. My contention was that a child who is developed to a certain point is just as valuable (and therefore an equal claimant for legal protection) as is another child developed to the exact same point. My opinion, as stated in the article, is that killing a child - a viable, fully developed child - is an atrocity, and the fact that your opinion lies 180 degrees away from that, is more than unfortunate.

-Al-

Name: Lesley

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: UK

Time: 2000-01-06 16:25:00

Comments: I am a 20 year old female and think feminists are hypocrites. Most of them just sit and bitch about men and how bad they are. When I watch shows like Jerry Springer, Oprah etc., I see females who have kids with the guy and say every child needs a daddy and why is he not with the baby she gets all the pathetic ladies applauding her but the reason he ain't with his kid is cos the mummy won't let him see the kid or the mummy just happens to be a total bitch to him when he is around the child. I think a lot of women use their kids to get at men. They are the ones who say they want the money from the dad when she runs off with another guy but at the same time women have always said that the baby needs a mummy. I don't understand. I actually know friends who have been raised with their dads and they are fine actually from what I have heard, most kids raised by single dads are fine but now a lot of kids are on drugs getting into trouble etc and you always hear that they been raised by single mother with no dad at all and I have actually heard females say it's the dad's fault cos he wasn't there. If he wasn't there then who raised the kid??? THE MOTHER probably. So, instead of ladies bitching about the males try to think about the situation you are bitching about. I also find that if a woman don't know who the dad of her child is she is pathetic (unless she was raped). All the females feel sorry for her especially when you see this on TV when the male gets tested to see if he the dad. The show host always gives the lady sympathy but she is so low. How can a guy be a dad if he don't

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

know he a dad at all? Women want praised for being a single parent all the time. They all look proud of the fact. If a guy a single parent people think he is a low life he gets pulled down more than a woman would.²⁰¹

Hi Lesley!

You covered a lot of ground there and made some very important points, concerning the importance of fatherhood, and some sort of moral restraint that should be shown by women. The Jerry Springer Show is one of the most moral-free outlets for depravity in existence today. It is only rivaled by other, similar talk shows. They get the most outrageous, sick, and twisted people they can find to come and talk about their lives as if they were normal. One of the worst things about all of those shows in the USA is that they are shown at a time of day when all the latch-key children, abandoned by their working/single mothers, are home from school and unattended. Children might as well be watching X-rated movies as to watch that filth.

Thanks for stopping by and sharing your thoughts with us!

-Al-

Name: galloi

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfed On In

From: utopia

Time: 2000-01-11 11:38:00

Comments: i am a male, but i know that women are superior. your war on all that is good makes me very angry. your brand of fascism is contemptable, as you would destroy the dignity and wellbeing of all that i care about. personally i am working hard to ensure that all forms of patriarchy are destroyed. traditional institutions, and particularly christianity are disgusting, ugly, immoral, and spiritually repressive. the soul is female, god is a woman, and all things female are inherently spiritual and supreme.²⁰²

So, how long have you had this inferiority complex? Didn't your mommy like you?

Think about what you are saying. Traditional institutions are what made us what we are today. These institutions have

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

created a society where women are no longer sold on a slavery block, or merely legal property of their husbands. They have rights, and they have respect because of those traditional institutions. Patriarchy brings with it responsibilities, and obligations. A man who is a leader in his home, is also responsible for the wellbeing of all those in his household. Traditional institutions, such as Christianity, force a man to treat his wife lovingly, and faithfully.

That which we are doing today, in tearing down our traditional institutions which made us what we are, will make us something different tomorrow, with different traditional institutions. One of those new "traditions" that folks like you are so eager to create, is a totalitarian government. It will make us all play nice with one another by jailing or killing us when we decide to go against its wishes. It is clearly the intention of Bill Clinton, and all of the Leftists, both Democratic and Republican, to increase the government's ability to force people to obey. If you choose not to obey the party line, you will suffer the consequences. Of course they do it in the name of "dignity and wellbeing" don't they? Of course they do. They do it in the name of the women. They do it in the name of the children. They do it in the name of the poor. They do it in the name of the elderly. People are fooled into ignoring what the government is really doing, by having their attention drawn to whom the government is supposedly doing it for. In the mean time more and more restrictive laws are being forced upon us, and our way of life is being destroyed. The "dignity and wellbeing" of the average American who either lived in the 1950s, or is descended from Americans who lived in the 1950s, is under severe attack by folks like you. The new institutions are hostile to their way of life, completely hostile. They will terminate it altogether if given enough time, and if people like me do not stand against them.

So, while you worship your goddesses and ignore your gods, while you snivel and worm your way through life as an inferior being, wishing to be what you worship, but never being able to reach your goal, you have lost your chance to be what you were designed to be: a REAL MAN. My condolences.

-Al-

Name: wendy

Website: the official #systemofadown website

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

Referred by: From a Friend

From: new york

Time: 2000-01-15 16:32:00

Comments: this page is sad. there are some valid points here and there, but overall they are just half-truths and prove that men are indeed just bitter about the progress women have made in history. we're all human. all equal. give it up, already.²⁰³

Wendy,

It is interesting how many times I have heard Leftists tell me, and those like me, to give up, as if standing up for the truth is no longer worth it because the government is on your bandwagon today. I remember what happened in the 1960s. The vast majority of Americans of the 1950s agreed with my position today. If the Left had just given up simply because they were in the minority at the moment, today we would be living in a tremendously better society than we live in now. Our future would be much brighter, and the vast majority of Americans would be happier. But the Left did not give up, unfortunately, and were able to wreak their damage upon our society. And then you have the gall to say, "give it up." Not a chance. What has been done can be undone, and will be undone.

You say this page is sad. I wish I had a dollar for every time I have heard President Clinton, your soul mate, say the very same thing about anyone who ever told the truth about him. He thought it was so very sad that someone would stoop to saying something or other about him, as if it were not true. Then later, it always turned out to be the truth! But he deflected the truth with the line, "I think it is sad..." just like you are trying to do.

What is truly sad, is what has become of the American family. Today, over 80% of our children are no longer raised by their real mother and father in the same home. That is thanks to feminism, coupled with other Leftist ideas. You can call this fact anything you like, but that will not change the fact that it is the truth! The number of single mothers, and the resulting children who are left unattended, and who get into trouble because of it, is outrageously high. Again that is the truth, and it is because of feminism.

What men are bitter about is not "progress" that women have made. Women are women today just like they were one

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

hundred years ago or a thousand years ago. They will never be men, no matter what people like you try to do to change that fact. Therefore, they have not progressed. They have stayed the same, just like men have. The only thing that has changed is that we have a government which has decided that the freedom of the ones, who make up the majority in our society, to run their own lives as they see fit, is not as important as having those same people kneel to the god of Leftist ideals. You applaud that oppression, and pretend that you do not understand why both men AND WOMEN are bitter about having totalitarianism forced down their throats!

We are indeed all human, but we are not all equal! That absurd lie is wearing very thin. Look about you and you will see that some are smart, and some are not. Some are rich and some are not. Some are strong and some are not. In a free society, those who have money are not treated the same as those who are poor. That is as it should be, because that creates a drive in the poor, if they are intelligent, to strive and improve their lot. If we were all truly equal, we would all live in the same sized house, in the same type of neighborhood, and would be driving exactly the same kind of car. But we do not do that, because we are not equal! We are all different, as individuals, and as sexes. You may or may not learn to accept the facts of life as they are, but that will never change them. If you, and your feminist friends had a whit of concern for women, families, children and America, you would "give it up." But you don't so my page, and others like it will continue to exist, and the right will prevail in the end. Tough break for your side.

-Al-

Name: Paul

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: England

Time: 2000-01-16 08:10:00

Comments: thank you, keep up the good work.²⁰⁴

Thank you Paul! I will endeavor to do so.

-Al-

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

Name: Sam

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfed On In

From: Arlington, Virginia

Time: 2000-01-19 13:57:00

Comments: Hello Al. As you may remember, I have posted here before. Since you have received some negative postings here recently, I thought I'd post something in support. I must say that the comments of poster #17 raised my eyebrows. Women are superior? The soul is female? God is a woman? Geez, I must have been living under a rock all these years to be ignorant of these things. I was under the impression that, not only Christianity, but ALL of the major world religions-- Judaism, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism and Taoism-- are rigidly "patriarchal". The founders of these religions or their key exponents have been, without exception, men. And most of these exponents have little or nothing positive to say about "female spirituality." In fact, the Buddha is even thought to have said something to the effect that women are absolutely incapable of spiritual enlightenment. However this may be, history teaches us again and again that MEN are the truly creative force, intellectually and spiritually, of all human societies. The rightful role of women is helping men and nurturing children to perpetuate future generations. I want to make utterly clear my own position that I am from the bottom of my heart, categorically, PRO-MAN and PRO-PATRIARCHY, and will do my part in ensuring the preservation and propagation of patriarchy and patriarchal institutions throughout society.²⁰⁵

Welcome back Sam, and thank you for sharing your insight as well as your support! There is nothing that I can add to an excellent post like that. It is upon folks like you that the future of our country is dependant.

-Al-

Name: Paige

Website: don't bother.

Referred by: Just Surfed On In

From: Wisconsin

Time: 2000-01-21 08:13:00

Comments: Dear Sir,

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

I know that no matter what I say, I will be cut down by your (slightly erroneous) views. Therefore, I will keep this brief. The destruction of the 19th Amendment would be disastrous to the nation. We would be limiting one half of the population from their rights as human beings, no less, no more.

Also, I would like to hear your wife's own personal views. I'm not saying she would agree or disagree with you, but it would be interesting.

By the way, the evil feminists got me early. I'm 16 and agnostic. Just thought you would want to know.

Let everyone hold their own views. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Paige²⁰⁶

Dear Paige,

You started right off with an error. No civilized person is "cut down" on my web page. (Those who are rude or hostile may be treated in like fashion, but that is a different issue.) I expose the fallacies of the Leftist mind. For those who associate their own value and being with those absurd ideas, it is, to them, as if they were personally being cut down. Try not to take this personally.

The removal of the 19th amendment from the constitution would be the single most positive thing done for our country in the lifetime of any person living today. The vast majority of women would have their rights protected by a democratic system where only men voted. So, your claim is false on the face of it. Women did not have the vote for most of the history of the USA and their rights were always protected. The steady trend towards the oppressive chains of socialism we see today is closely tied to the female vote. The liberal politician relies heavily on the female vote to work their destruction upon us all. (e.g. Bill Clinton was elected and reelected by the female vote!) Women, in the long run, will suffer more from this left-sliding trend than will men. In any case, we all will be living lives that will be much less fulfilling, as the totalitarian government continues to grow, fueled by the female vote.

My wife has proofread every single article on my web page and she loves the page. The page, and especially the lead item, the poem "A Woman's Place" is dedicated to her. She is a happy homemaker with an IQ that is above the mean

for medical doctors, and she has a web page of her own which is today drawing about 2500 visitors a day. She is a very special woman, and I am a lucky man because she is mine.

There are many atheists and agnostics that agree with my point of view. There is certainly nothing requiring religion to understand the basic scientific truths of biology. Men are more aggressive, tending more towards leadership, more competitive and stronger than women are. These are biological facts, not religious dogma. I have one section of my page that is dedicated to exposing the hypocrisy and absurdity of anyone claiming to be a "Christian Feminist" because that is an indefensible position. It is just as true for the other major religions of the world. Most religions came from mankind trying to understand the world around itself. The answers they found were based upon long standing experience of how humans reacted to the situations of life. If you look at the "rules of the road" created by the world's religion, as to how men should treat each other, completely aside from any view or concept of God or gods, they are an attempt to make sense, and order out of the chaos that humans are capable of producing. The leftists are attempting to tear down that sense and order that America displayed so thoroughly in the 1950s, and pull our society ever closer to the chaos. But, it is a fact of historical life that when a society draws too near to chaos, the rigid rule of totalitarianism raises up to restore order, painfully and cruelly. That is what I am fighting hard to avoid, and those of your point of view are fighting hard to bring to reality.

As feminism becomes more successful, the rights of women, along with those of men, will be further curbed. Why? Because it takes a big, strong, oppressive government to be able to force unnatural things upon people. If you noticed, since the big, strong, oppressive Soviet Union fell, the countries that it was unnaturally controlling through oppression, are now fighting like cats and dogs trying to snap back to normality for themselves. That is always the ultimate result of oppression.

When you say, "Let everyone hold their own views," I am left to wonder what you mean. Do you mean that you are glad that I have the views I have because they are mine, and you are celebrating them with me? Or do you mean what the average Leftist does, that is all those who have been converted

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

to the Leftist ideals must be left alone, to have their "own" ideas, while the non-conformists' views of the non-Left are attacked with great vigor? I have seen how the Left, "leaves folks alone" to have their own ideas. There are law suits, bombs, beatings and other "benign" ways of leaving people alone who disagree with the Left. Couple with that the steady stream of propaganda from the television, movie, and news-print media, and we see that the Left is hard at work attempting to make sure that no one who disagrees with them will be left alone to "hold their own views."

Thank you for dropping in and signing my guest book.

-Al-

Name: Andrea

Website: none

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-01-21 14:44:00

Comments: Although I disagree with absolutely everything that you stated on your page, I am just going to state my opinion on one thing. You said that you believed that a woman should stay at home. I am not even going to ask you why you believe this is so. Did you know that many medical advances were made by women? What would've happened if they remained "at home"? Or what about specific economical and political advances? What would've been different had they remained "at home"? There is no problem with women working and after I reading all that you typed, you still did not fully back up your reasoning for saying that a woman's place is to serve her husband and raise children. Honestly, the way you described everything, you seemed afraid that women would rise above men. As in everything, it's all about power. Centuries ago, the world was ruled by men, and basically still is today. It is a fact that men are physically stronger than women and I acknowledge that. However, it has not been proven that men are mentally more intelligent than the opposite sex. Many tests that have tried to determine which sex was more intelligent were abused and modified to suit the other (usually for the male advantage). In essence, like I stated before, I believe that women have the same right to work as men do, and it is extremely unfair for one to try to keep women from doing what they want, which in many cases is to work.²⁰⁷

It is my opinion that there has not been one medical advance made by women that would not have been made by a man if the women were not tying up the research money and facilities. Certainly there have not been any advances that would justify what we have done to our children by having women leave the raising of their young to strangers or the blind luck of latch keys. Economics? You certainly have to be kidding. Politics? They have fallen over so far to the Left that the original ideas that this country was founded on are gone completely. So, no, there is nothing that women have added to the workplace that men could not have done better. And the abandonment of the children is unforgivable, and carries with it a price that we all must pay.

I never cease to be amazed at the absurd things that feminists keep coming up with. I do not fear any woman rising above men. That will never happen unless the government forces it to, and then it is the government that made it happen not the "superiority" of women. It is a fact of biological life that men, even with only equal intelligence, will be the leaders and "on top" in the power game. They are physically bigger and stronger, which in the long run would be enough, but they are even more importantly, more aggressive and competitive. Even if the intellect and the physical strength were equal, the power will go to the more aggressive. Men are BIOLOGICALLY made to rule and women are not. Men are vastly superior in the math and science areas, as is consistently shown in all tests. It is also true that men dominate every field of endeavor, from cooking to writing, from entrepreneurial wizardry, to software development, and that is without even mentioning the total domination that men have at the top in sports. In all cases if a woman can be said to "hold her own with the men," it is considered a great compliment, as I have often heard stated by feminists. That pretty much says it all, doesn't it?

Nowhere on my page have I suggesting that women do not have the right to go out and apply for work, or to work if they can be hired on their own merits. I have said that it is a bad idea, and my page lists many reasons why that is so. But the only RIGHTS that are being violated are being violated by the feminists! The very basic RIGHT to hire whomever you desire to work in the company that you yourself created, has gone away, thanks to the Leftists. The same is true for the

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

RIGHT to promote whomever you like for whatever reason you choose. The Leftists seem to think that a man who creates a company, did it for them, and not for his own reward. But contrary to the Leftist drivel, self determination is what a capitalistic system is all about. Leftist socialists think that the government owns all businesses and therefore should control them all, especially the hiring practices. The feminist movement for the most part did not try to move women into starting their own businesses on their own, but instead used political power to force businesses owned by men to give part of those businesses to women. That is called stealing, for anyone honest enough to care.

Perhaps one day a feminist will stumble onto this page and actually realize what this is all about. It is about the abuse of political power, and the removal of our freedom as citizens of the United States. We once could choose how we were going to live our lives, and now the government chooses for us. The feminists think that is great, that is why this page will never go away.

-Al-

Name: Me

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-01-21 19:10:00

Comments: I never cared much for the issue of feminism or anti-feminism before I saw this website, and I started to like it and agree with some of your views until I started reading your guestbook. You never argue with any statement made by people that support the basic idea of your views, while you vigourously attack anyone that opposes them. Okay, this site proposes an argument, but still. For example in post #20, Sam says "The Buddha is even thought to have said something to the effect that women are absolutely incapable of spiritual enlightenment." This is like saying women don't have souls. I doubt you are a Buddhist, and I doubt that you agree with this belief(at least I hope not). Yet, you made absolutely no attempt to stand up for women. This was a perfectly good opportunity for you to be a man and protect other women and society from stupid opinions like that. This leads me to believe that in a society run by chauvanists that claim to have women's best interest at heart, men

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

would say nothing against misogynistic ideas. You never do. Another example- the post about the book sexploitation- you did not say one word against that book. Have you ever read it? You would disagree with at least half of it if you did. Anyway, what I have learned from you is that women wouldn't need feminism if men would treat them right. You never draw the line between masculinity and misogyny, and that is not treating women properly.²⁰⁸

Hi Me, it is I.

There is a simple and obvious reason why I vigorously attack the lies of the feminists. Feminism, along with the other Leftist causes, is destroying this country. The USA of today is unrecognizable from the same country of the 1950s, and especially of the land of the Founding Fathers. That is a disaster in my opinion. In addition to that, the feminists have pro-feminist propaganda being spewed forth on every television show, radio show and newspaper. You will never see one thing negative put out about feminism in any of those media. Now, don't you think that I have the right to have one place that will not accept that disgusting philosophy unchallenged? Well, whether or not you agree, I do have that right, and I am going to exercise it. Here, feminism will not have a free ride like it gets everywhere else.

Do you care what the Buddha says? I don't. Your objection seems rather strange to me because Sam did not make that statement as if it were his view. He was making the point that galloi was saying something completely absurd to say that women were spiritually superior, and that his idea of god was female. What Sam said was correct. Why should I argue with correctness? Sam certainly did not say that he believes that women have no soul or that they cannot be enlightened. He was showing examples of religious thought that completely disagreed with galloi. I don't see the problem. (I happen to think my wife is a goddess if that counts for anything.)

If you have read Sexploitation I would love to hear your commentary on it. The part that was posted in my guest book was correct in what it said, and it was not hateful towards women, just feminists. I have not read the book beyond that post in my guest book. I never said that I have.

So, you have not made your case. In every case when women have been attacked in my guest book by the feminists I have risen to their defense. When housewives have been

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

ridiculed, or stay at home moms belittled as being lazy, etc., I defended them vigorously. If the most you can come up with is a statement by someone, someone who doesn't even agree with Buddha, who says that Buddha thinks women have no souls, you are standing on very weak ground indeed.

Thanks for sharing your opinion.

-Al-

Name: Stephanie

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-01-24 09:29:00

Comments: You say that you respect women; yet, did you realise that one of the webpages you promote on your site advocates Polygamy? How in the world does polygamy show respect for women? A woman, according to you, is expected to be faithful and true to her one man, yet by promoting Polygamy you are saying that the same standard does not apply for men! And please do not try to defend this with the argument that this is all taking place within the holy bonds of matrimony. It is disrespectful and wrong. If a woman is expected to look up to her husband and give him her respect and DEVOTION, then it is only right that she is given the same in kind, and you cannot be giving a woman the same amount of devotion if you are bedding another one. You are a hypocrite if you condone this way of life.²⁰⁹

I think that it is pretty sad that the only thing that you can find to complain about concerning my page isn't even something on my page. If you look at my links page you will find that I do not endorse the pages listed, I merely state that they are interesting. Apparently I was correct because you obviously spent more time on one of them than on my page.

To put your mind at rest, I am not polygamous, and I never will be. If that is not good enough for you, oh well.

-Al-

Name: Amit

Website:

Referred by: From a Friend

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

From: Cleveland, Ohio

Time: 2000-01-24 18:45:00

Comments: Dear Al, You might not remember, but I used to write to you regularly last year. I must congratulate you on your determination. I have since moved from India to America as a graduate student. It's a battle that we have already lost, not because we are weaker, but because we still have not gotten out of our "Gentlemanly mode"--ask any woman, Men are still expected to "pay" at dates, support the wife and children, undertake lifethreatening jobs, die in the army, become criminals and rot in jails as the whole societies' attention and sympathy is solely for "disadvantaged women"---It is a heart breaking sight to see MEN(MOSTLY bLACK) SLEEPING OUT IN THE OPEN IN THIS FREEZING COLD ! most single mothers ,however, continue to eat up our tax dollars,while the men have to fight for survival, The no. of young men in US jails is disturbing ,and why they take to crime, you well know.The moral degradation in this country and as a result of the popularity of US culture amongst the rest of the world, is disconcerting. Let it go Al, let history take it's own course, there's nothing you or I can do about it, not atleast untill men stop fighting each other. Only then can we fight the unjust and almost tyrannical laws that are so biased against men, then a mEN'S MOVEMENT WILL START--I ASSURE YOU.Till then, I just have to tolerate secondrate female MBA students at My university's businesss school as the univ. has to maintain a "healthy" ratio of men to women.We cant fight it till we unite ourselves, and it is not in the nature of man not to fight for territory, money and, sadly, women. All the same,I wish you all the best. Amit²¹⁰

Welcome back Amit! What? You thought I would have gone away and given up? NO way!

All movements must start somewhere. Why not here? When men and women have their noses rubbed in the truth, some of them will realize that what is going on is just plain wrong. That is what fires up the folks who are willing to make changes happen. For decades it is has been the Leftists who have been making change in our society, and you can lay the responsibility for the decadence of our society today upon those very people. We must now find people who are

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

willing to work just as hard to undo that damage. Then we will have a movement.

Thanks for coming back for another visit and sharing your thoughts with us.

-Al-

Name: Bo

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-01-25 07:40:00

Comments: Al, you seem to be an avid prolifer, just wanted to know your stance on death penalty. Bo²¹¹

No Bo, I am not an avid "pro-lifer." Let us define our terms. I am an avid anti-abortionist, fighting against the pro-abortionists, who are incorrectly labeled "pro-choice." This deceitful practice of finding some label which sounds great but does not accurately reflect your point of view, I find repugnant.

What I am against is intentionally taking the life of an innocent person, whether born or unborn. I have no problem whatsoever taking the life of a murderer or rapist, because they have earned that just punishment upon their own heads. I hope this clears things up for you.

-Al-

Name: John Kapitaan

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Columbus

Time: 2000-01-25 10:47:00

Comments: We're reminded again and again of feminists who wanted to know why men make up most of the hardened criminals. Maybe because when men kill, their actions are labeled as crimes rather than mental illness. They have no "post-partum depression" to fall back on, even though they, too, might snap from the pressures of parenthood. And when they do, they will get hard time in brutal prisons, not therapy and job training. What say, Al?²¹²

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

You are correct that women are treated differently by the criminal justice system. I think the reason for that is that women are not considered the same as men by the courts, or by society in general. Society knows that women are different than men, and have different drives and motivations. That is why our legal system originally built up its double standard to be able to treat women in a softer manner, as becomes the gentle sex. I happen to agree that women should be treated differently than men, because they are different.

The feminists have the luxury of doing hypocritical things like what you have pointed out. Feminists admit that men are naturally far more aggressive than women are in the area of crime, shown by the much higher incidence of violent crime by males. There is no debating this. Yet the dishonest feminists fight tooth and nail to avoid the obvious fact that men, to the very same extent as in criminal behavior, are more aggressive in every area of life, including all areas of business. The media of course never bothers to point out the major flaws in the feminist dogma. The media just quotes feminists unchallenged, allowing them to spread whatever lies they feel will help their cause.

Thanks for dropping in!

-Al-

Name: Krysta

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Here

Time: 2000-01-25 15:51:00

Comments: All I gotta say is thank God my boyfriend isn't a sexist scum like you are! He has MUCH more class than you'll ever have. The world can do without scumbags like you.²¹³

You have to get it straight in your mind. It is very difficult to be both the scum and the bag which holds the scum. I know it is a tough concept for some minds to grasp. Perhaps if we started with something simpler...

It is nice to know that you have set yourself up as judge as to which individuals are fit to exist in this world and which are not. We can all rest easier now. Especially someone who is so eloquent, and who can express such deep thoughts in such a compelling way.

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

Thanks for stopping by.

-Al-

Name: Veteran's Wife

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Pennsylvania

Time: 2000-01-26 11:33:00

Comments: TO AL,

*Fem-utopias' walls
are a cracking;
time for God's Goths,
to go a sacking.
God's Barbarians—
of all races—
tired of trash,
rubbed in their faces.*²¹⁴

Welcome back! Excellent bit of poetry. Right to the point.

Thanks for sharing it with us.

-Al-

Name: Rick

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: springfield va 9 miles from d.c.

Time: 2000-01-26 12:14:00

Comments: I love your web site it should be required reading but there is no way to forward your articles to my friends e-mail addresses or did I just miss something?²¹⁵

I do not have my page set up to forward articles to people. It sounds like an interesting idea that I may look into. In the mean time, if you go to an article you like, you can hit CTRL-A (or "Select All" in the "Edit" menu) and then hit CTRL -C (or "Copy" in the "Edit" menu). You then will have the article stored in your clipboard on your computer. You can then paste the article using CTRL-V (or "Paste" from the "Edit" menu) into an email to send along, or you can paste it into a text editor so you can save it as a file to send out later. I hope this helps.

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

-Al-

Name: Analysr

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-01-29 01:17:00

Comments: I find myself agreeing with one of your guests who claims that feminism will die only when its time is ripe. It is true indeed. What you seem to forget is that the only constant in this universe is change. Change, change and change. Change for the sake of change and nothing else. This universe has an insatiable taste for change. And "power-shifts" are just one example of the change. Throughout history power has changed hands between nations, races, religions. Now it is between genders. Do you really believe people have become so blind they can't see the unfairness of this man-hating trend better known as feminism? No, my friend, they can. But this is a "change" which will come because the "time" for this change has arrived. And when the time for this trend to end will come, it will leave as illogically as it arrived. When a woman gets raped do you say "What's the fuss, honey? The guy just made love to you. Isn't that what you wanted anyway? Isn't that what all women want? You should be thankful to the guy. He did it without you asking" Nope you don't say it! No more than you would find it funny 100 years ago if a woman cut off her sleeping husband's dick. The point is don't look for logic in anything. When the time for change will come people's attitude will also change--and totally illogically. The government and media which you hold responsible for this trend's spectacular success are merely pawns in the grand scheme of things. And when the time for another change will come some equally illogical chain of events will bring about the change. Call me a lazy, impractical, wishful-thinker/daydreamer. But your site will achieve nothing until.....the time is ripe. And when the time will come your site will not be needed. Take care my brother and [friend].²¹⁶

I am sure that it brings you great comfort in resting your future, and the future of your country upon the whims of Fate. I however, think that it is the right and obligation for all good men to oppose falsehood when it is forced upon their

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

fellow citizens. When a man fails to oppose evil and destructive activities, he is guilty of perpetuating those acts as if he performed them with his own hands.

I feel that your point of view would make us little more than ants, who think that it was merely fate who has dealt them a mean and fiery blow, when actually it is the farmer who has poured the gasoline down their hole and lit the match. It is not some random action of fate that has taken over our government and our media, and sitting still while hoping that they will change their activities on their own is like hoping the Sun will not rise tomorrow. My web page may not be enough, and it may not solve the problem, but it is important, and it does serve a purpose. Sitting on my hands will certainly not get the job done.

Remember that this feminist movement was not some spontaneous illogical popping of some random cosmic gas bubble. It was planned and choreographed, along with the other Leftist movements, with full support of the media. It continues to be perpetuated by the government and the media. George Orwell strikingly showed what kind of power the media have in his book 1984. He highlighted the fact that whoever controls historical "fact" and the information disseminated in the mass media, controls the minds of the masses. People cannot remember what happened even a few weeks ago, and they rely on the media to tell them what their own history is. Any lie that the media choose to hammer home, over and over again, will be accepted by the masses. ANY LIE. That is a lot of power, my friend.

Thanks for dropping in.

-Al-

Name: Ches

Website: cypheric

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: London

Time: 2000-01-29 06:16:00

Comments: I found your views to be generally repugnant. It's not that I believe they're not thought out arguments, because you've obviously done research and spent some time on this site. It's just that I think you are misguided. There are inequalities between the sexes and they are treated differently. It shouldn't be this way. Each individual should be treated on his or her own merits in a purely utilitarian

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

ian and pragmatic manner. I think that I personally would be wasted in a life of making house and caring for babies as these skills are not ones that I possess. Instead I should use the skills I do have to benefit the community in which I live. This is a morally superior standpoint in my opinion and a much more efficient use of the human resource.²¹⁷

Anyone who has been raised in the United States of America, and probably any Western nation, and who has subjugated their opinions to the media and the school system, will of course find my views to be repugnant. The honest ones will do as you have, and admitted that my site is well thought out, and researched. But they will hate it because it goes against their own personal brainwashing. Once you take propaganda to heart, you will defend it to the death, or until you can be deprogrammed.

There are of course inequalities between the sexes. For the brainwashed egalitarian, that is terrible. The idea that men and women should be different is just horrible. The very world view of the feminists is shattered by the fact that girls and boys are not interchangeable. And since they are not the same, society has never treated them the same. Outrageous!

But is it? Is it outrageous to allow a woman to do what she wants to do and stay at home with her children? Feminists think so, but I do not. Is it outrageous to allow a business to hire whomever it wishes, for whatever reason it wishes? Not in a free country it isn't! Forcing a so called free society to twist into an unnatural egalitarian nightmare is what is truly outrageous.

If only the Leftists would practice what they preach instead of forcing their view of life upon others, all would be well. If every person were treated as their talents, and desires demanded, feminism would die on the vine as the vast majority of women did what came naturally to them, instead of being forced into doing what the feminists want them to do. Since you wish to use humans as resources, as if they were machines or property, you would find that you get a lot more out of a society of people in the long haul, if they reproduce themselves. You see, if you just forget about the future generations, and focus on your selfish wants today, as any child tends to do, you may have a lot of fun today. You may have a great career, and make lots of money for yourself, and society may even have a temporary financial bump. But the price in

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

the future will be a society that collapses into crime, poverty, and chaos. The children are trained at home as to what kind of adults they will be. It is up to the parents to be there to do the training.

The feminist only looks at how much of a loss to society it is to have a woman not performing the role of a man. Of course that is a loss to society of some certain amount. However, where the feminist completely fails to use their brains is in an area where, if you can believe the name they chose for themselves, they should be extremely focused. What is the loss to society if a woman does not perform the role of a woman? I believe that women have performed a vital function throughout history. I believe that society itself is impossible without that role being performed by women. I believe that if women do not perform the role of rearing the next generation, and of holding the family together, society will not be possible to maintain for an extended period of time. In other words, it will be a much greater loss to society to have a woman not perform the role of a woman, than it will be to have her fail to perform the role of a man.

As long as there are men, their role in society will be filled and executed adequately by men. If women try to fill the male role as well, and abandon the critical traditional role of women it will be disastrous for our society, and as any student of history knows, things do not go well for women in a chaotic society. When law and order break down, women will be treated as resources in a most appalling way. I wish to avoid that for our future generations. If you wish to speak of morally superior views, that is it.

-Al-

Name: Love

Website: candyflesh

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-01-29 11:15:00

Comments: Wow, for an apparent "chavenist" you're not much of a man. Anyone who'd blame everything from school shootings to divorce must really not have much confidence in himself. You seem to try to grasp at irrelevant points to try to prove yourself. In fact, you don't appear to be educated at all. It's a damn good thing no one listens to idiots like you.²¹⁸

For someone who is standing in judgement of educational quality, you certainly have a great deal of trouble expressing a clear thought. You cannot spell the word "chauvinist", you leave your second sentence dangling, leaving one to wonder what you are babbling about, (Blame? Blame whom?) and you make a "logical" leap concerning my confidence which is impossible to follow. But you are going to stand in judgement of other people's education. Very amusing indeed.

Perhaps you can follow the reasoning behind your first two sentences, but there is a certain lack of continuity there. If I read you correctly, you are attempting to equate a lack of manhood with someone saying that women are important to society. You appear to be saying that understanding the facts of what is going on in our society is not a masculine quality in your mind, such as it is. That is like saying a tree is not a tree because it has bark and branches.

And since you have nothing left in your mental arsenal, you stoop to name calling. My condolences. Perhaps in a few more years you may grow out of it.

Name: John Singleton

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-01-29 18:55:00

Comments: Al, I have visited many men's forums/guest books on the net, but I find myself attracted only to yours. I think the main reason is your emotional sturdiness. It is obvious you can handle criticism without getting hurt and taking it personally. Just being intelligent and well-intentioned is not enough if you are going to stay in this business successfully. You must also possess that elusive and rare bird known as emotional stability. Your replies, full of re-torts and rebukes, are intelligent and fun to read, but nowhere indicate you have lost sleep over one half, semi-disagreeable line. Continue. And you can count I will keep coming back.²¹⁹

Thank you John. I do not lose sleep over what feminists say, because I am quite confident that they are wrong. My confidence is based on biological grounds, as well as on the evidence of precedent: throughout history the vast majority of folks had my view on the subject. I have my own experience

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

of dealing with women in real life, and there is no doubt that women are completely different creatures than men. From that it must follow that women should have different roles than men in our society. Anyone who challenges that must have an ulterior motive, and they are usually quite blatant in exposing it.

Thank you for dropping in and sharing your kind words. I look forward to hearing from you again.

-Al-

Name: Katia

Website:

Referred by: From a Friend

From: South Carolina

Time: 2000-01-30 10:07:00

Comments: I find this site very destirbing. You paint a woman to be a weakling. Someone who depends on the support of others. Your arguments are rather biased and one-sided. You say 'look back at a time when marriages stayed together, and children were raised right' ok. I'm looking back. I go hundreds of years. I am thinking you are refering to the pilgrim type days. When people went to church 8 hours every sunday. They where very religious back that sir. Do you spend 8 hours at church every sunday? Woman were respected back then also. Becuase they did something no man could do. Everything. They could raise the children and milk the cow. And if something should happen to the husband, they could take over the family business. Men respected woman back then, they were not mere objects. You say that woman tend to be more nurturing than career oriented. That they have patience with the children. That they are weaker and depend on men. And are driven to keep a tidy household. Well, frankly, that is bullshit. I don't have a desire to get married. I have a plan for myself, and my career. I don't need a man to support me, and I find nothing appealing about a relationship. I am not a tidy person, I clean so that I will be able to function properly and not kill myself trying to get down the stairs, but my place is not what you would call tidy. I cannot stand children, and even when I was a child I couldn't stand children. I have very little patience with them. So what now? I am nothing like you say I am. You want the truth so I am here to give it to you. You are scared. your scared what will happen, when men and women are treated

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

100% equal. Your afraid you will have to do the hard worl, you will have to clean and raise the kids. Your afraid that your job might be in serious jepordey, because a woman can now do the same job just as well as you, if not better.²²⁰

A point of distinction that I am continually forced to make to the unperceptive feminist, is that when I use the term, "women," I am speaking of the vast majority of women. Normal women. It is not intended to say that there are not women who are not normal, who are even masculine in their views and attitudes. Of course there are such women but that does not lessen the truth of my statements. While exceptions never "prove the rule", they do not throw it out either. What is important is that what I say about "women" applies to the prohibitive majority of women, even though some misfits are left out.

I find it interesting that you could even question the fact that women are more socially dependant than men. It is documented beyond any reasonable questioning that women are biologically driven to be "sociable." From birth, as documented in the book *Brain Sex*, women are people oriented, and far more interested in close personal relationships than men. If you use the term "chick flick" today, anyone will know that you are talking about a relationship movie, a movie which women will love and men will avoid. Your protest on this point is absurd.

As for being weaklings, that has two aspects to it, and one of them is true and one false. So, let's separate them out. If you say that women are physically stronger than men, you are either trying to promote a lie or you are mentally deficient. Anyone who has watched boys and girls grow up into men and women, will realize that men are physically stronger. In addition to that men are stronger in the areas of competition and aggression. These facts are clearly demonstrable beyond any doubt to an open minded individual. If you are saying that because these facts are true, by definition women therefore are "weaklings" then I would have to agree with you, only because you have defined the term so poorly.

The fact is that women are also strong, in a feminine way. They will attempt to face down a much bigger and stronger man if he threatens their children. Women have demonstrated great strength in all the areas of motherhood, and family

preservation, in the face of great adversity. Women are not weaklings.

The fact that you are not driven to be a wife and mother is far from surprising. The fact that you are not interested in a relationship with a man is not surprising. As I have said many times before, society cannot be built around the needs and wants of a the abnormal, lesbian or merely masculine minded women. Society must be build around the normal men and women. To destroy the lives of the vast majority of people in order to make a small minority happy is absurd, and that is why feminism is absurd. Of course some women want nothing to do with a normal life, just like some men want to wear dresses. That is completely beside the point.

How often you go to church is of no concern to me. In the 1950s most women were at home with their children and they were not Puritan fanatics. So, this attempted point of yours is both absurd and irrelevant.

Perhaps the most amusing thing that you said is that you are not "an extreme feminist." You don't like kids, you actually think women can do the same job as men to the same level, and you don't want a man in your life. That is pretty funny.

Women are not in all the advanced classes in greater numbers than men. They are in the area of law, and some similar types of courses but in the areas of engineering and the sciences they are not. And of the women who are in those classes many of them will be leaving their professions in order to raise their families. Women are not becoming stronger, they are becoming more confused, because they have been exposed to the government sponsored propaganda at an increased level for a longer period of time. As far as my job is concerned, you could not be more wrong. There are hundreds of men in my company doing a job similar to mine, and only one woman. There are no new women knocking at the door to do the job either. It is a technical field and it requires a masculine brain to do it. Most women do not have it, just like most men do not have the feminine brain required to raise kids well. If you look at the engineering department or the software department of my company, the number of women is also very small, and my company is one of the most ardent celebrators of diversity of all sorts, including gender related diversity.

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

So, where does that leave us? It appears that you have no idea what you are talking about. No matter, feminists are usually in that condition.

-Al-

Name: Katia

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-01-30 10:18:00

Comments: Oh by the way, those nice little facts up there about children growing up in single-mother households, why don't you post statistics on children growing up in single-father households. No wait, that would defeat your purpose of relying on the woman to do all the work.²²¹

As is typical of all feminists you missed the point, completely missed the point. Those facts about single mothers demonstrate completely and undeniably that single mothers do a poor job in raising children. If the statistics were gathered on single fathers, even though they are far smaller in number, I would expect that they were doing a poor job of it as well. That is making my case that much stronger. My page is not intended to show that men are better people than women, or better parents than women. Patriarchy and chauvinism does not say that men are better than women, merely different than women, and therefore by definition, women must have a different role in society than men have. It is the joining of men and women together in families that provide the only natural way for children to be raised. It takes the soft and nurturing woman combined with the strong and unbending man. The child needs both of these things to grow to his highest potential, and to have all of his needs met. Only a feminist would care whether a single mother or a single father is better, because their movement demands actions that will fracture families and leave children in broken homes. What is important for people to understand is that single parents of either sex are not going to do the job well. The optimum situation will include the real mother and real father together for the entire process of raising the children, in other words, for life. Anything else will be less, significantly less.

-Al-

Name: Sam

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Arlington, Virginia

Time: 2000-01-31 13:45:00

Comments: Al, every time I come back and read your responses to the posts here, I find myself thinking "You took the words right out of my mouth." It makes me wonder. Maybe some minds, like yours and mine, were just meant to grasp the truth about sex differences.... Or, more likely, some people are seriously in denial of the truth. In any case, I really enjoy reading your responses. They are rational and to the point. Also, I would like to add something to your response to Katia's post. As you suggested, men dominate the fields of engineering and some of the hard sciences because, quite frankly, the male brain is meant for these difficult fields. And even though women do quite well and tend to outnumber men in law classes, it is noteworthy that in the fast-growing fields of patent, internet and computer law, which require degrees in technical fields, men far outnumber women.... We are all equal in our humanity, but equality of potential is an alien concept in nature as well as in human societies. It is high time that people be able to speak the truth about these things publicly without being labeled "nazi" or "fascist" or whatnot. Once we as a society break this taboo on discussions about biological sex differences, we can move on to an even more perniciously taboo topic: racial/ethnic differences. Keep up the good work, Al. The more that people visit and read your web page and pages like yours, the greater the chance that they will finally see the light.²²²

Thank you for your kind assessment of my posts. And I appreciate your additional insight concerning Katia's post. You are quite correct. The Left has a cutting name for every offence that you can commit against their philosophy. They will open up their little red knapsacks and pull out a ready-made hate word to throw at you in reply to any point that you make. That way we will never be able to speak about the facts concerning the issue, and instead we will spend all of our time denying the implications in the name that we have been called. It has worked for them for decades. They will keep using the tactic as long as we let it work. We must reach

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

the point where we no longer care what they call us, and just continue ladling a healthy dose of the truth upon their lying heads until they are exposed for what they are.

This page is not about the races of man, or ethnic differences within the races of man. Should you wish to discuss that topic I am sure there are web pages out there for that. On this page, we are on the issue of feminism and there I will hold my focus.

Thank you for dropping in. -Al-

Name: Dan Frost

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: New York

Time: 2000-02-01 00:32:00

Comments: Al, Do you think it is possible to be a feminist without having certain warped sense of "justice" and "fairness"; absolutely no sense of proportion; and extreme emotional vulnerability ? Feminists write all sorts of comments at others' sites, but when you write a couple of witty lines at theirs they wanna crash your computer. Imagine living with such a mindset!²²³

When dealing with those charlatans on the Left, I am continually reminded of the great fairy tale, "The Emperor's New Clothes." What a beautiful depiction of the Leftists is made in that story. The Emperor, and all his people were sold a complete lie. Fabric was woven out of thin air, and purchased by the Emperor, and later it was displayed by that same foolish man. He was told that this material was so special that only wise men could see it. Just like the feminists, who sell their egalitarian fables as if they were real and true. What blew the lie out of the water in the fairy tale? Why, all it took was one small child speaking the truth. Can you imagine what the "tailors" who were selling this lie to the emperor, would have been willing to do to shut that kid up before they were paid? That is a perfect picture of the Leftist at work. He is weaving his lies and selling them to the people, and living in mortal fear of the truth being discovered. Naturally he is violently hostile to anyone speaking out with the truth, because he know he is doomed if the truth ever becomes known. That is why they want to crash your computer.

-Al-

Name: Paul Sineder

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Finland

Time: 2000-02-01 00:42:00

Comments: I agree with an assessment here that your guest book is worthy of repeated visits. Are you aware how many site owners sign their own guest books and forums with the kind of entries "they" would like to make their site appear "successful", "popular", and "achieving what it is supposed to achieve". You are obviously not doing that, for if you did your site would also have been reduced to a worthless, manipulative, devious garbage designed only to send you on ego-trips. Bye.²²⁴

Thank you for that observation. If I had to stoop to such tactics, it would be a waste of my time operating this guest book, and a complete waste of time for you to read it.

-Al-

Name: Amit

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Cleveland Ohio

Time: 2000-02-01 10:53:00

Comments: Nothing can happen, unless of course we get out of our "Gentlemanly frame of mind". Al, if there is one criticism that I want to point out, it is that you are gentlemanly too. Unless we treat these dykes as "Guys", they will never learn. But you do handle the abuse with a lot of patience. I hope my cynicism doesn't rub off on you.²²⁵

You have cut me to the quick. :-)) I am used to being called all sorts of names, and accused of all sorts of horrible things, but never before have I been accused of the appalling crime of being too Gentlemanly. Alas, I stand guilty as charged. I am a civilized man, and not the barbaric caveman that feminists have always accused me of being. However I am something that they can never accept and cannot effectively defend against. I am a man who is willing to speak the truth. People have a natural tendency to like the truth. In fact

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

they often even love the truth. They also have a tendency to despise lies, and especially those who have lied to them. Why do the Leftists become so frantically hostile when anyone says anything that is not Politically Correct? The bloodlust is in their eyes as they go for the jugular of anyone who has the effrontery to speak the truth in public. Why is that so? Because they are defending a house of cards, built upon lies. Even the smallest wisp of a breeze of truth threatens to knock their house down. That is why they cannot tolerate any open discussion of the truth. It is why a man who speaks out against feminism in his workplace will be fired for it. It is why a man who speaks his mind in an interview in Sports Illustrated is suspended from his job for a few months. No breath of truth can be allowed to circulate around the feeble, dark house, lest disaster set upon them.

Do not confuse a Gentlemanly man with a weak man. It is no coincidence that military tradition requires of an officer that he be an "officer and a gentleman." That characteristic has never stopped the military man from fighting bloody battles when necessary. We gentlemen are not wimps.

-Al-

Name: Naeem iqbal

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfing On In

From: Pakistan

Time: 2000-02-03 02:16:00

Comments: Dearest Al bro, it's me again, from long ago and far away. Its not so much as feminism but the "westernisation" of the world that I have problem with. I don't know if you are aware but the whole world is under immense pressure to subscribe to whatever YOU folks currently feel is "right" and "wrong". People seem to feel almost guilty if their definition of right and wrong is not matching yours. Even thousands of years old religions are being reinterpreted to bring them in line with what the MIGHTY WEST considers to be right at present. Hindus have already reinterpreted their holy book to somehow allow homosexuality in their religion. (nope for thousands of years homosexuality was NOT allowed in Hinduism, and many Hindus are extremely uncomfortable with the current shape of their religion) And self-professed Muslim "scholars" are now cropping up every where to mold and distort the meaning of

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

Quaran to make it "palatable" in today's (west dominated) world. I m a non-practicing, non-believing Muslim, hence I'm not emotionally involved in this issue, but I know one thing: Islam is Islam . and Quaran was not written to please NOW. And I do know what Muslims have believed to be Islam for generations. And it ain't what the "scholars" are saying it is. To give an example, Islam does give a husband a limited right to hit the wife (not beat the hell out of her) in certain circumstances. But since DV nowadays is all the rage in the west, and even giving your wife a hard glare is the ultimate crime in all the universes that ever were or ever will be, Islamic "scholars" have no choice but to give the words of Quaran entirely new meanings to disallow even the remotest possibility that a husband can even lightly slap the wife who is in hysterical fits. And it very easily can be done. You see, Quaran is written in 14-15 hundred years old Arabic which even Arabs themselves now don't completely understand. many words have become obsolete or their meanings have changed substantially. The line of reasoning "scholars" are using is that since Islam is a "good" and "humanitarian" (whose definitions of good and humanitarian? You guessed it!) religion it cannot allow "bad" (again the definition of rich and mighty) and if something appears to be "bad" it is because Muslim religious leaders have misinterpreted those difficult and obsolete words of Quaran. Allah simply could not have thought along the lines other than those followed by NOW members. Frankly, I find this whole scenario quite funny. The scholars, mostly women, have used such strange lines of reasoning that at times I have found myself doubled-over with laughter. Using the same lines of reasoning it can be argued that a horse is actually an elephant. Why Al, why? You folks, or in other words, NOW, has taken over the world. I m standing far enough away to avoid the sparks and close enough to enjoy the show. Why not do the same buddy ?²²⁶

If this were all some academic process that only mattered to a few eggheads, I would agree with you that it qualifies as a very entertaining display of absurdity, which merits nothing but laughter as a response. Unfortunately, these twisted lines of reasoning are descending upon our lives with real impact. The Leftist "standard of ethics" has suddenly been raised to the level of divine inspiration. Our society has been forced to kneel and worship at the altar of the god of egalitarianism as

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

if it were the highest divinity of the pantheon of all possible gods. The amazing thing is, as you have pointed out, that religions that are very old, and once very respected by their adherents, are now being disassembled and reformed in the shape of this new god. Old morals and old standards are cast aside. Old gods and old beliefs are abandoned. Now the universal acceptance of the phony Leftist religious system is sweeping the world, metamorphosing into apparent continuations of all the other religions. Christianity is being replaced with it, even though the old name is retained, the beliefs are being exchanged with the new religion's. As you pointed out the Hindus and Muslims are seeing the same transformation in their own doctrines. It is really quite remarkable that these religious people who have clung so emotionally and unswervingly to their religious beliefs for so long, would suddenly just throw them aside in favor of some new, and unproven belief system, especially one which is so obviously flawed. History tells of the Islamic people boldly protecting their beliefs with their lives and their swords. What has happened? Propaganda is more powerful than the sword!

BTW, since it has become clear that some readers of this guest book do not yet understand The Axioms of Life Subscribed to by the Chauvinist Corner - See Axiom #1), I should at this point note that I, and I am sure you, do not support beating wives. It is a theological point that we are discussing here. I point this out lest some confused soul misunderstand the conversation as it passes over their heads.

Thanks for paying a another visit to my web page. You are always welcome my friend.

-Al-

Name: Chuahaan

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfed On In

From: New Delhi, India

Time: 2000-02-03 11:19:00

Comments: I hate to Admit , but the Pakistani is dead right,...The culture in our country has become totally perverse, we could have learnt from your example and not have burnt our fingers. Things will change only when America comes full circle. But you are doing a good job, Al. I'm sure 99% men secretly agree with you, but very few (like Me) have the guts to actually support you.²²⁷

I think you are absolute right that the vast majority of men agree with my position, in the privacy of their own thoughts. It is a sign of how weak men have become in this age that they will believe one thing and live another, on such an important issue as this.

Why do you suppose it is that the whole world is following what the USA is doing today? America reached where it was by doing something completely different than what it is doing today. Feminism had zero to do with what made America powerful. Very little of what is considered Politically Correct would have even been tolerated during America's rise to power. All of this absurd nonsense came along after the fact. It is going to pull America down. Why would anyone want to emulate that? If a nation wants to copy America, it should choose the America worthy of emulation, the pre-1960 America. That would tend to build any nation into a greater nation. It is that philosophy that I want to help America to return to. I can only say to you that someone needs to speak up in India and point out that Political Correctness is a parasite on America, not any part of the greatness of America.

Thank you for stopping by and signing my book with your kind and thoughtful words!

-Al-

Name: A Male Feminist

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-02-04 05:35:00

Comments: i have been reading letters here, and some of them give the impression that women have the world by the b____, and men have become so disadvantaged that sites like urs are now needed to "balance" the world. never forget the fact that nature itself has put women to disadvantage substantially. imagine having to bleed every month. Phew!! somehow get the feeling it must not be fun--and that is, may i remind, without PMS-, imagine having delicate, and a lot more vulnerable bodies. the responsibility of carrying and then delivering babies. pressure to look "beautiful" just to be on par with other females. sometimes i cant sleep at nights so i go driving 100s

of kilometers, stopping at the darkest and strangest of lookouts to enjoy the views of my beautiful city from all angles, at all hours of the night-completely alone. then i ask myself this: would i be able to do this if i were a woman? the answer is not only no, but hell no. the example might not sound like much but makes a point. that being a woman brings its own set of limitations and problems which we men cannot appreciate. sometimes i miss my morning tea and the caffeine imbalance wreaks havoc on my mood. imagine what affect unavoidable chemical imbalances must have. I still believe women have raw deal.²²⁸

It is interesting that you come to my page, a page designed to point out the flaws in feminism, and point out many of the very same things that I do, while at the same time claiming to be a feminist. Let's go down your points one by one:

1. Those, whom you refer to, that are upset, and who have signed my guest book, are upset at the destruction that feminism --not women but feminism -- has inflicted upon various societies around the world. Yes they have sometimes made the same mistake that most feminists do, in using two words like feminism and women, as if they were interchangeable. Of course they are not. It is like trying to use the words icicle and water interchangeably. Yes, feminism talks a lot about women, but there are far more women on this planet who are not feminists than those who are. An icicle hanging from a roof, will be made up mostly of water, along with some contaminants, but it is not representative of all water. Most water is liquid and resides in the oceans, not frozen hanging from a roof.

2. I have never forgotten for a second that nature has made women different than men. My page is filled with that fact and the results of that fact. It is completely absurd to ignore that fact, as feminists so ardently try to do. They demand that there are no significant differences and that men and women should be treated the very same, and have the same roles in society. That is completely insane!

3. Yes, women have far more delicate bodies, and they hold the future of our race in their wombs. That is why they should be protected by their fathers, as they grow up, and by their husbands when they are adults, instead of being thrown to the wolves to compete with men in a man's world. It is ri-

diculous to set up a society where childbirth is a secondary role for women, and having a career is the primary one. That is a suicidal approach for such a society.

4. The pressure to look beautiful is sexual. It is tied together with the winning of a mate in order to reproduce. Since women are weaker than man, and the species requires some system in place to reproduce, the stronger male must provide protection for the weaker female, and provide support for her and their children. That is the natural way that humans have developed as a method of survival. For a man to sacrifice his freedom, his efforts, and possibly his life, for a woman, nature has made it so that women are physically appealing to men, or beautiful. The more beautiful she appears, the more likely she will attract the attentions of a male who will be willing to hang around for the long haul. This has gone on for thousands of years and isn't likely to change real soon. Even the feminists of the 70s have now given up their manly coveralls, and no-makeup look in favor of more attractive attire.

5. Your point about limitations on women has been understood, by myself and most other anti-feminists all along. We never forgot it, the feminists did! Feminism has caused the rape and murder of many women by convincing women that this is a new era for women, and women should be able to do anything that a man can. Some poor women were fooled into believing that nonsense and paid the ultimate price for it. Women must be protected by males. Feminism denies that fact, but it does not make it any less true.

6. I am amazed that you bring up the point on hormones and emotional imbalances, subjects for which male chauvinists have been booed and hissed at for mentioning all along. You speak like the most avid male chauvinist. You point out that women are significantly different than men, weaker than men, and emotionally erratic, as compared with men. All of these things are true. How you move from there to the point where you call yourself a feminist is beyond logic to follow. What logically follows from your points is that society must treat women differently than men. They must have a different role than men. They must be protected by men. Patriarchy, properly administered, has been the primary and traditional solution to this difference in the sexes for thousands of years. In the United States, throughout its history, women have been treated like ladies, and with respect by the vast majority of

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

men. They have not had to become cannon fodder like men. They have not had to die young from heart attacks, black lung disease or other ailments, because they overworked themselves supporting their families like men have. Males die at every age at a higher rate than women do, even as children.

So, your points all support my point of view, and condemn the feminist point of view. Thanks for stopping in and sharing them with us.

-Al-

Name: Naeem Iqbal

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Pakistan

Time: 2000-02-05 00:57:00

Comments: Of course not, Al, bro. I do not support men beating wives at all!! also as instructed by you I also read the axioms again, and found myself agreeing with them. I also noted with much gratitude that you took time and trouble to correct my poor English in my first letter. Much obliged. I'm not a native speaker, sorry.

Just an observation, Al. Are you aware that feminists not only hate men but they are also very uncomfortable when they see two men getting along well. They will do whatever they can, use any available tools, psychological or any other type, to break up the friendship of men. Imagine living with such perpetual malice, hatred, and conspiracy. I will probably never meet you, but if you get this mail just know that I will always admire your honesty, boldness, and the strength of your convictions.²²⁹

Naeem, I was certain that you did not support the beating of wives, but I mentioned it to dissuade those who are looking to find fault where no fault exists.

Feminists are a very confused group of people. They know that women and men are different, and they know that any reasonable person would expect society to treat those differences differently. So, from there the only option is to go for the unreasonable to be able to still promote their insane cause. Nothing they is too surprising. Their anger and their hate is probably the most striking feature they present to the world. Nothing good can come from such people.

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

Thank you very much for your kind and supportive words.

-Al-

Name: Geraldine Shipley

Website:

Referred by: From a Friend

From: Pocono Mts. of Pa.

Time: 2000-02-06 06:29:00

Comments: I agree with what you are saying. This was my view of marriage, I wanted nothing more than to be allowed to stay home with my children. Unfortunately, my husband did not respect me, had no qualms about hitting women, threatened us with a gun etc.. I had to get us out of that. But, even though I was divorced I was lucky and got a job teaching so I could be home with them when they were out of school. I had to work since he did not pay child support.²³⁰

Name: Hayden Scott

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Columbus, Ohio

Time: 2000-02-08 11:05:00

Comments: Al, Worry not, something unnatural cannot exist for too long. And if it does, then perhaps we are wrong somewhere. By the way, have you ever noticed that the kind of friendship that exists between men does not and cannot exist between women. This just shows how petty and deceitful their whole gender is. As far as the dude who talks about PMS, periods etc. PAL, have you noticed the attitude of the police towards men as compared to women, do you know how many teenaged men are in jail these days, how many die everyday in occupational deaths, how many get fired everyday for speaking their mind, how many die in WAR, how many get ruined after losing their children, money and all self-esteem due to the wretched divorce laws? We get hurt too, only we are conditioned not to cry, or to even think about it. And get this, women can never, never, dominate, we will be getting back pretty soon at all the feminist nonsense by our own movement. All the injustices that are done to men in the guise of Feminism is going to be accounted for someday.

All the best AL, may you succeed.²³¹

Hayden

Hayden, thank you for the good wishes. We must remember that women are not the villains in this scenario. Women, for the most part are good hearted people. They want good things for others. That is why they are so easily duped into supporting things that look like they are beneficial, when in actuality they are destructive. The female vote has been a disaster for this country, not because women are evil creatures, but because they naturally search for security, and they naturally wish to nurture those who are down on their luck. Socialism and Communism pretend to offer great security and great support for those down on their luck. It only follows that women would naturally vote for things that would promote the deadly and destructive philosophies of Socialism and Communism. Because of that, it is no surprise that our nation has been moving more and more towards Socialism since women got the vote. We have the big Federal government involved in everything today, where it is oppressing us all, to an ever increasing degree and the female vote has been instrumental in the growth of that monster. Again, not because women are evil or stupid, but because nature has given them a temperament that is wonderful for the home, but a disaster in the political world. Actually, men are at fault for ever giving women the vote and it will be up to the men to take it back.

Women do approach friendships in different ways than men do. The book *Brain Sex* shows this very clearly. Women, define themselves very much more than men do, by their relationships. Even "career" women do. Masculine friendships are inherently different than female friendships, because men are inherently different than women.

I love women. I admire women. I do not consider them petty and deceitful as a gender. Oh yes, there are many examples of such women but not all women are like that. I do not believe that most women are like that. While women often focus on different things than men do, it does not make them petty. They naturally have a different priority list than men, which makes them confusing to men, and vice versa. I think that feminism is filled with many women and men who are actually evil in intent. However, I in no way feel that way about women in general. A good wife and mother is the high-

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

est form of life on earth to me. There you find love, unselfish, giving love. What can rise above that?

Men have been harmed greatly by the feminist movement. The divorce laws were created in an era when women were homemakers and completely dependant upon their husbands. If husbands dropped their wives for younger women, that was unfair and the laws protected the woman from that unfairness. What went wrong with the divorce laws was the move towards "no-fault" divorce. It removed the protection that the man had before. If his wife started cheating on him, a husband was the offended party and the wife lost her status as a protected woman. He could get custody of the kids, and not have to pay her support any longer. Today, it doesn't matter if she is completely at fault, she still gets the benefits of being the "injured" party. That is a travesty of justice and must be rectified.

When you add to this the extreme increase in the number of divorces brought on by feminism, it becomes very clear that men are being harmed very greatly today. At the same time women are being harmed by being left in a situation where they have to vainly try to fill the roles of mother and father to children who do not deserve to be half-orphaned that way. Feminism has been a "cure" that is a thousand times worse than the disease which it was mobilized to fight.

I hope, that when the accounting takes place, that there are men in charge who realize that only the feminists have been the culprits, and not all women. For I will fight as hard to defend women against unjust retribution, as I am fighting now against feminism. I am sure you feel the same way.

Thanks for dropping by and sharing your thoughts!

-Al-

Name: Brent Moritz

Website: Toledo

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-02-14 16:55:00

Comments: What the hell, after everything, you still support the b____s who have ruined the lives of millions of men world over?²³²

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

Brent, where is this coming from? Perhaps you have forgotten about all the millions of wonderful women who have given happiness, joy and completion to their husbands, who have been loving and caring mothers to their children. In every part of my page I have supported women who are home-makers and mothers, who are giving birth to, and raising the next generation. It would be insane to turn on women with hatred, when they are the ones who give us all life. No sir, I do not hate women, and I never will.

If you are asking if I support women who cast off their family obligations for career or some new love, and then rob their faithful husbands of money, children, and their happiness, of course I do not. Anything that breaks up a family is an inherently bad thing.

I hope this clears things up for you.

-Al-

Name: Tina

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: With Satan

Time: 2000-02-14 17:41:00

Comments: First of all, yes, I do have an extreme hatred for men. You are all greedy, selfish, adulterous, perverted, evil, wicked, ugly, mean, etc., etc.. The man is the devil, he is the reason why the world is so awful like it is. Hitler was a man, Stalin was a man, serial killers are all men, school shooters are all male, most criminals are male, etc. Men are all the same, they are all evil, and they should all be destroyed. The world would be a much better place without human males. Second of all, men may be able to lift heavier stuff than women, but it is a proven fact that the strongest muscle in the body is in a WOMAN'S body, the uterus. YOU try giving birth to a ten or nine pound baby...²³³

So much hate. You attack Hitler who was, worst case, responsible for maybe 60 million deaths. You attack Stalin who was responsible for about 100 million deaths. School shooters and all mass murderers combined, are probably responsible for less than a thousand deaths. You on the other hand want to kill 3 billion males. And you call men evil. You hypocrite! Go get some help, you are truly ill.

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

BTW, do you know how many women there would be if there were no men? Zero. -Al-

Name: Paul Mc

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Scotland

Time: 2000-02-15 05:25:00

Comments: Well Al, it seems that Tina is a true product of feminism. Man hating for the sheer hell of it! Who does she think the majority of people were that voted Adolf Hitler to power? Yes it was women. And of course she failed to mention the small fact that countless millions of men died fighting the nazis. Just watch "Saving Private Ryan". How many women do you see charging up the beaches, on D day, having their guts blown out and killing other people? If not for these "evil men", little tough talking b____s such as Tina, would either be dead or enslaved. And who does she think is going to kill off all men? Women? Well I think it is safe to say that in a hypothetical war between men and women, men would quite easily be the victors. Also, she uses the same old "childbirth hurts like hell" statement. She forgot to mention that childbirth these days can be rendered painless with drugs, or even sending the mother to sleep while the baby is delivered. I will return Al. Best wishes, Paul.²³⁴

Tina may have been just trying to pull our chain, or she may be as sick as she sounds.

I remember a series of books written a few years ago, by a man named John Norman. They were about a planet named Gor, where women were pretty much all slaves. They were branded, had a permanent collar put on them and treated like merchandise. John Norman put forward the idea that all women secretly yearn to be slaves, and to be put under discipline. If all men were as Tina claims that is exactly how planet Earth would be today. So, your point is absolutely valid. Obviously men are far from the animals that Tina (or Norman) thinks we are. Men protect women, from the few men who really are animals. That is why we have policemen. That is why husbands have traditionally been the protector of their wives and daughters. Those acts of civilized behavior, and of

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

love for women by men, have been the staple of Western civilization for thousands of years.

Childbirth is a tough experience. I watched both my sons be born, and it is was not fun for Mom in either case. But it is also a fact that Mom's memory of that experience faded fast, and the joy of having the little guy with us at home was more than full compensation for the ordeal. Women were made to have babies, and I will never argue against the fact that women do it better than men would. You do best, that which you are designed for. I am glad that they have made childbirth a bit easier for women today, but it is still no picnic. But I defy anyone to match that look that a new mother has when she holds her newborn, with any other emotion or joy in life. If there is anything in human existence that is pure giving, pure unselfishness, it is a mother's love for her child. That is why day care is a curse, because the child is taken from the pure love of a mother, and given in replacement the forced civility of a paid employee. That is why latchkey children are bound to be problem children. Mother and child. Child and mother. They are made for each other. It is the cycle of the ages, the real history of mankind.

So, men who hate women, and women who hate men, are fighting against the very biological process that gave them life. Men are gifted in ways that help them provide for, protect and lead a family. Women are gifted in ways that help them rear, nurture and mold a family into a whole unit. This intermeshing of the feminine and the masculine, while producing, protecting, loving and educating the next generation, is the magic of the family. The magic that feminism is aiming to destroy.

Thanks for dropping in and sharing your thoughts Paul!

-Al-

Name: Amit

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfed On In

From: Cleveland, Ohio

Time: 2000-02-15 08:46:00

Comments: Dear Al, I'm happy to see that like minded people like Paul are finally speaking their mind,, even though I know you will edit the "obscenities."

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

Dear Paul, Tina is no Feminist, she is (and I'm dead sure) just a very, very ugly woman who is single and lonely and is therefore nursing this extreme hatred for men. I know the type.

But your point is well taken...next time you thank the "men and women" of the U.S Army (or any army on earth, or any life threatening occupation), just think Women never die, never suffer, only "gentlemen" do. Paul, the point about pregnancy is trivial, women are joining every field after Men have figured it out and simplified the whole process, even warfare these days is rarely face to face (unlike the US CIVIL WAR where teenaged men died like dogs and their arms and legs were amputated without Anesthesia). Men continue to fill jails and Unemployment lists, I guess there's nothing we can really do ... we must get out of our "gentlemanly" frame of mind.²³⁵

Amit, We have gentlemen like Paul drop in and speak their minds from time to time, and we have had a number of outstanding ladies drop in as well. I hope, like you, that many more of us begin to speak up more often.

I too am tired of hearing the news say, "The men and women of the armed services." I even heard some moron the other day say it about an earlier war where no women were in any way associated with combat. The reason they are so quick to phrase it that way is because they are very good at propaganda. Very good indeed. They know that if you hear something over and over again, you come to accept it. It is not a question of convincing you of the rightness of what the propaganda says, it is only a question of conditioning you to expect what the propaganda says. That provides a pre-molded form for your thinking process. Any thought you think, read or hear, will fit into the form or it will clash with it in an unpleasant manner. You cringe, you shutter, at anyone who has the guts to proclaim boldly that something which is not PC is true. That is why so many folks completely lose control when they stumble across my web page. I dare clash with the propaganda and they do not know how to deal with it.

There is far more intent in your nightly news to promote the Politically Correct propaganda than there is to inform you about what is going on in the world. There is far more concern in the hearts of the writers of most shows about the PC agenda than there is in entertaining. It is a fact that number one, before all else, the foundation and structural supports for

any show that hits the air must be PC. If that is not the case, the show will never air. (Perhaps the most misnamed show on television is "Politically Incorrect," where the host is one of the most PC people on TV.) So, they will take every opportunity to promote women in non-traditional roles. They will do it often, and with a gleam in their eye.

We do need to stop worrying about being a gentleman in the face of feminist opposition. The feminists have relied on the gentlemanly nature of men for over a century at least, as they have promoted their destructive cause. They whined and whined to get the vote. The men, wishing to be gentlemen, gave it to them. If those men had used their heads, instead of being gentlemanly, they would have seen where that mistake would lead us in America. We have given up much of our freedom, and our government is feasting on our incomes in evermore greedy bites, all to pay for the Marxist/socialist programs that are so much a negative part of American life today. It will only get worse, as our families are destroyed by feminism. More and more women will be left alone with their children and the piggish state will be more than happy to take your money out of your pocket in order to give it to these women. Each year the problem gets worse, and the female vote simply drives the process forward.

With each step that feminism took, men gave in to let it happen. That is a fact and cannot be ignored as a significant contributing factor to the process. Men must stop backing up and start walking forward again, taking charge, as they traditionally did. Men must be the leaders in their own home. Men must be the leaders in government and industry. The myth that women are simply wild about weak and sensitive men is refuted by the simple fact that the stronger, and less sensitive a man is, the easier it is for him to get a woman. (The "strong silent type" is someone that women have dreamed over for generations.) Biker gangs, are some of the worst offenders in abusing women, but they never have any trouble filling their harems. What we need, are strong men who are sensitive to the needs of their women. Men, who are leaders, but who are caring husbands, normally have no trouble getting, and holding onto a wife.

As I understand what you are saying, you want men to stop giving in like wimps, and start taking charge of our society, at all levels, as they used to do in the past. In order to do that, they must give up their current, weak-kneed, wimpy atti-

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

tude, where they are more frightened of being called a "sex-ist" than being called a "wimp." Or as you phrased it, they must give up their "'gentlemanly' frame of mind." I couldn't agree more!

-Al-

Name: vana

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-02-15 20:03:00

Comments: Al, this is not really for you (sorry). This is for Amit. What the hell does he want? to start some war with women? He is simply a mysoginist, and he needs help. What is this crap about the "gentlemanly" frame of mind? No, really, men should go ahead and be jerks instead of nice guys. Something really fantastic would come out of that. You know, men ought to fight with iron and blood for dominance and rule women with an iron fist. Amit does not belong in any civilized country and he should move to Afghanistan or something. He just proves how stupid some men become without the proper emotional guidance from women.²³⁶

Vana, Amit does not want to start some war with women. He feels, as do I, that such a war would be too lopsided in favor of men to be worth fighting anyway. Being a gentleman is not what Amit is attacking. Backing down, and being a "gentleman" when feminism makes its demands, is what he wishes to stop. He would like to see male leadership in our society, like we once had, before feminism took over. The blood he is talking about is real blood shed by real men, in real battles that women did not have to participate in, while the media gives them the same credit for it as the men receive.

Also, you must remember that Amit comes from a country that has not been ravished as slowly and as deeply (yet) as America has been. In his country the change has been very abrupt, and there are many people there who remember what it was like before, and who do not like the changes. It appears to me that Amit hates feminism, not women.

Thanks for sharing your thoughts.

-Al-

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

Name: Amit

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-02-16 08:23:00

Comments: Dear Al, You seem to be attracting some weirdoes to our site. Madam, before you do decide to insult me, at least check your grammar, That's Misogynist, not Mysoginist. And by the way, I do not think you are a Misogamist .You need some brains for that. I do not intend to start any war, as I believe wars are fought between equals (you know exactly what I mean). The "crap" about Gentlemanly frame of mind is the following: when we start treating you people as "one of the guys" without extending any special privileges which women have traditionally enjoyed for God Knows how many centuries, you will realize and accept your inferiority (or that you are "different"). It is not my intention to dominate women, only the weak minded seek to physically dominate, I wish for our society to come back to the natural order of things, with each both sexes having well defined roles. I have never slighted those women who have been wonderful mothers, for I too, owe my existence to a womb. But latchkey children will come back to haunt you when they become Adults. As far as Careers are concerned, name one woman who is # 1 at anything in the world (even cooking, sewing etc.)? However, you have the spineless U.N backing you up. This will come full circle, believe me. Finally, do you know that the condition of men is much, much worse than women in Afghanistan? 14 year old boys have to fight for the Taliban and captured Boys of the Resistance are tortured in jails. When one is not even able to look at women (courtesy, Burkas/veils) what harm can you do to them? Women can get away with murder in Muslim Countries. Anyway, go to hell, I'm not going to waste precious energy in communicating to you what I really stand for. My rapport with Al is vital, please do not intermit it. Regards, Amit.²³⁷

Amit my friend, you will find that people will visit this guest book who disagree with what you have to say. The number one thing to keep in mind is to fight with ideas not names. Whether someone goes to hell, or doesn't go to hell, is not ours to determine. Whether someone has brains or not

may be indicated by a short post in a guest book, but may not provide the definitive answer as to whether they do or do not.

You have made some very good points. Women are inferior to men in certain areas which includes the area of war, both physically and emotionally. In the home, when a man comes in from a long day at work, he is glad that a warm woman awaits him, and not a man. In this case the woman is superior to a man. While the term "inferior" is one of those words that clashes with the accepted PC terminology list, any two things which are different, such as men and women, must have one that is superior and one that is inferior for certain purposes. Otherwise, they would not be different. A gold ring and a gold necklace, are different. For finger apparel a necklace is inferior, but for the neck it is superior. In price one of them may be superior but in sentimental value the other may be superior. A master at the piano may be terrible at chess, while the chess master may not know one note from the other. Difference demands superiority and inferiority which is determined only when judged against the task or purpose to be undertaken.

Politically, feminism has done great harm to our society, and it will take men with passion against that movement to overthrow it. So, I commend your passion.

Your point about Afghanistan is very well taken. The average American knows little about the world except what the media box tells them. They have their little minds nicely washed and formed in just the right manner to please the Leftists in charge. Do not expect much more from them.

Perhaps your most important point is concerning the return to "the natural order of things." What makes feminism so disgusting is that it goes completely against what is natural. We have names for women who want to take charge of a man, and they are not pleasant names. As I was growing up, it was common to say that a woman "wears the pants in that family," when a woman began bossing her husband around. Women as well as men did not respect either her or her husband when a woman did that. It was not natural. It is just as unnatural to have women in supervisor roles over men, or in the boardroom. A return to the natural order of things would be quite refreshing. If we could just get the jackbooted foot of the government from off our necks long enough to make it happen, it would be wonderful!

Thanks for dropping in again.

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

-Al-

Name: Allison Albaugh

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Atlanta

Time: 2000-02-17 14:21:00

Comments: Thank you for your wonderful website and the power of your convictions. You are quite rare among men today!²³⁸

Thank you Allison! I really appreciate you taking the time to show your support for this page. I hope that my page will do a small part in helping more men see what their natural role should be in our society, and to be great husbands to women who appreciate them for it.

-Al-

Name: Dominic Tagliaferri

Website:

Referred by: NewsGroups

From: NY

Time: 2000-02-23 18:19:00

Comments: I'm speechless. Thank You.²³⁹

You are welcome!

-Al-

Name: Sam

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Virginia, USA

Time: 2000-02-24 10:34:00

Comments: Al, I just finished reading one of the new articles on your page, "A Leftist's Response to The Feminist Invasion," and one word kept coming to my mind as I read your arguments: POWERFUL! As I read through every one of your points, nodding to myself "Yup, Yup, that's right ...," it dawned upon me that the arguments of the man you were responding to represent, in a nutshell, every bit of the nonsense that the media and government have been showering upon the American people over the last few decades.

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

I sometimes wonder--just WHAT IF views like yours get aired with equal time as views like the leftist you were responding to, on a major T.V. network during prime time? It's incredible this man actually believes some of the things he says. For example, get a load of this: "The totalitarianism you see is actually a constitutionally enforced set of rules you (by virtue of your citizenship) have agreed to live by." Now that's got to be one of the most hilarious lines from a leftist I've ever read! (In case anyone blames me for taking the man's quote out of context, the "totalitarianism" he refers to is equal rights for women-- as if American women did not long ago achieve equal rights for all practical purposes. The TRUE totalitarianism that Al CORRECTLY points out is that of the government enforcing society to accept SPECIAL rights and privileges for women over men)...

Anyway, all of this goes to show how warped one's ideas can become when one submits unconditionally to the altar of an egalitarian political ideology. The perfect antidote to this is an excellent link on your page that I believe everyone should visit: The Domain of Patriarchy at <http://hugin.imat.com/~sheaffer/patriarchy.html>. This site shows persuasively that in human societies, on the whole, men will inevitably be socialized for leadership, and women will be socialized for domestic and nurturing roles. Life is like that. Physiological and psychological differences between men and women has made it so....

As far as I'm concerned, there is no reasonable dispute that-- statistically speaking-- women are incapable of competing with men for leadership roles in business, government or the military. In my own work organization, I have seen irrefutable evidence that men not only work far longer hours than women, but outperform women in a wide variety of quantifiable tasks IN REGULAR WORKING HOURS. However, because my employer has an affirmative action policy to meet a certain quota of women, less qualified women are hired over more qualified men and are kept employed and promoted to managerial positions even when their performance is inferior! But alas, the leftists in my organization have kept the truth under the belt and I'd probably be fired immediately for voicing the truth openly to my employer....

I'd like to suggest that managers and supervisors who visit your page and generally agree with your views should, as a MORAL

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

DUTY, oppose, to the extent possible, affirmative action policies or any other government pressure to hire and promote less qualified women to meet quotas or some kind of statistical representation. In a free society, and an efficient marketplace, people should be hired and promoted based on nothing else than MERIT. If that means top-level managers and executives are 95+% men, then SO BE IT.... Al, more and more men and women are coming around to the truth. Keep up the good work.²⁴⁰

Sam, thanks for your input. I think you make some very good points. I would like to say that in a free society, people should be hired and promoted based upon nothing but the criteria that the company decides is best for the company. It is up to the company to determine what it considers MERIT. If it has the opinion that men are better workers than women, it should be able to hire only men, or promote only men to any position. If it feels that women are better workers, then it should be able to hire only women, or promote only women to certain positions. The thing is, in a free society you choose what you are going to do with the company you created, and the government lets you do just that. If you are forced to be "nice", "caring" or "fair" you are not free. As a free man you have the right to do what you please, as long as it does not interfere with someone else doing what they please. You do not have the right to pollute the water system of the town where your factory is operating, but you have the right to hire whomever you please, for whatever reason you please. You do not have the right to crush a competing company by using illegal business practices, but you do have the right to run your own business as you see fit.

Of course that free society that I am referring to is not the USA. In the USA, you do not have the right to hire anyone, or refuse to hire anyone based upon your personal wants. The government will determine for you what type of person is right for your company. For example, you will hire females, and you will promote females in what the government considers adequate numbers or you will be subject to discipline or even closure of your business. Merit is completely besides the point. Freedom is the last thing on the government's mind. The Leftist agenda is all that matters, and nothing else.

The craziest thing is that freedom, when it exists, applies to all equally. It is the ultimate right to choose what you are

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

going to do. It will allow you, no matter who, or what you are, to start your own business, and to hire whomever you want. It will allow you to excel to the level of your own abilities. No group of people in a free society can be held down, because they can use their own talents and their own freedom to launch their own solution to their own problems. All they have to do is to try and they will succeed. Freedom is the ultimate equal opportunity employer.

But the Leftists hate freedom. They want everyone to be just like them. They want all to act in a manner that they approve of. They want you to think just like them. There is no room for freedom in their plans. Just like they did in the Soviet Union, they want to control everything, right down to who owns what and who can do what. Who you hire, and why you hire, is their business, they think. In fact there is no part of your life that they think is outside of what they consider their business. You will be a "right thinking" citizen or you will pay the price. Look at college campuses across the nation, and see how many professors have lost their jobs for not being Leftist enough for their particular institution. Look at all the opposition there has been to students who want to create organizations on campus affiliated with the Right. Those who control our media and our government today, do not hold freedom close to their hearts at all. They are completely obsessed with making all citizens Politically Correct, whether they like it or not, and freedom be dashed.

Thanks for signing the guest book and sharing your thoughts!

-Al-

Name: Madchen

Website: Institute for Historial Review.org

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Michigan

Time: 2000-02-26 00:33:00

Comments: I am a woman and I like to be dominated by my man. Feminists are the kind of women that don't want men to open doors for them and don't want help from men in opening jars because they want to prove that "a woman is equal in strength to men". Well I as a woman, love it when guys open doors for me and offer to help me. And I don't mind being labeled as the "weaker sex" because in a lot of ways we are and that is just fine with me. I am glad that I am

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

NOT equal to men. I wouldn't want to be. I think women that want to be equal to men are in-the-closetlesbians.²⁴¹

Madchen, Thank you for dropping in and signing my guest book. In our society today, thanks to the tremendous amount of effective propaganda that we have been subjected to, it crashes against the accepted party line to have a woman speak the truth about what she really feels, as you have. Women demonstrate with their actions that they prefer a man, who is a man, strong, and dominate. That does not mean, abusive or manipulative and most women, unlike the feminists, can tell the difference between the two. A man can be powerful and yet gentle. He can be dominate, and yet understanding. It is one of the glorious mysteries of our species the way a man and woman, who are so different, can mesh so perfectly in a loving relationship. A normal woman will not only appreciate a real man, but she will yearn for one, until she finds him, and then cling to him once she has. As you pointed out, the feminist has no use for a real man, because she wants to be one herself.

Thank you for stopping by and sharing the views of a real woman.

-Al-

Name: Michelle

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-02-26 17:41:00

Comments: Are you saying that a man can't love his child like his wife can?! I'm a feminist and I don't plan on having kids because it's not my kind of thing. Having a kid is not cheap, and takes a lot of responsibility. You seem to forget that everyone is different. We all have our own likes and dislikes. No one is the same. You have to realize that not every woman is gonna feel that she belongs at home or in the kitchen...And I would like to respond to what Madchen(what kind of name is that?!)said in your guestbook. First of all, I've got a boyfriend. I am FAR from a "in-the-closet LESBI-AN"... Just because a woman thinks that she is equal to a man, or just because she doesn't obey his commands, does NOT make her an "in-the-closet LESBIAN". And there is nothing wrong with being a

lesbian, my cousin is a lesbian and is the sweetest, nicest, funniest person you could ever meet.²⁴²

Michelle, yes I am saying that a man cannot love his child like his wife can. A woman loves her baby like a woman, or in a feminine way, and a man loves his baby in a masculine way. A woman wants to cover the child with protection and let nothing of the world harm him, while a man wants that child to grow and master the world. If a mother and father take their young son to a park, and the son runs over to the monkey bars, Mom wants him to make sure that he doesn't get hurt and Dad wants to know if he can make it to the top. Both parents do not want the child to be hurt and both parents want the child to reach the top, but the greatest amount of concern of is each is as I said. The child needs both kinds of love. And that is why single mothers make such a terrible job of it, but a child, especially a young child simply must have a mother, because she loves her baby like no one else can. Women have been doing that job for thousands of years and it is instinctual. They do it differently and they do it better than a man can. If you check out the animal kingdom, you will find mother and child is basic to survival of any species.

If you had gone through my guest book, you would find that you feminists are simply clones of each other saying the same stupid things. You all say that I have forgotten that people are individuals. That is absurd but you keep saying it. How many of these different women you speak of are athletic enough to play professional sports with the men? None of them. When you watch female sports is clear that even the best of them are severely inferior in ability to the men. The point is, that while normal women are different from each other, those differences fall within a range of behavior that is normal for women, and that range is not the same range that is normal for men. The book *Brain Sex* also describes your unfortunate condition. You should read it. You will find that a female brain in the womb, if it is not exposed to the proper hormones at the proper time can develop in abnormal ways. It may become masculine, and not like children like yourself. It can even become lesbian, which the same process but to a different degree. Unfortunately for your theory, women who have gone through such a process are not the same as men, or equal in ability to a man, but instead merely doomed to live in frustration at being driven to be a man without the equip-

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

ment to be able to pull it off. It is sad, but our society cannot be constructed in such a way that punishes the normal women, in order to satisfy the wants and desires of you and those like you. Remember, that my objection to feminism is not that female feminists are trying to compete with men, because that is a ridiculous desire, doomed to failure. What I object to is the government assisting women in that attempt, and in promoting the feminist agenda in our schools.

FYI, If you had looked it up, as I just did, you would have found that there is an actress by the name Madchen Amick, who played Shelly Johnson on Twin Peaks. She is a very beautiful woman.

Your depiction of women being inferior to men, virtual slaves, running around following orders is distorted and filled with hate. Women who are homemakers are doing a critical job for their family and for society in general. They are not inferior, and they are not slaves. A good husband is not a domineering slave driver. The feminists wish to promote that myth in order to try and convince women who want to be homemakers that they would be fools to attempt it. It is a lie, that is directed at the goal of killing the role of homemaker, so that the abnormal masculine minded female will not appear to be abnormal any longer in our society. The end result is the abandonment of our children, and chaos in our society as those unsupervised children grow into uncivilized, self-centered adults.

Ted Bundy was the sweetest, nicest, funniest person you could ever meet too. That doesn't mean that there was nothing wrong with him. Lesbians definitely have something wrong with them. If all women had that same thing wrong with them, the species would die out. Fortunately that is not the case.

-Al-

Name: Amit

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfed On In

From:

Time: 2000-02-28 10:52:00

Comments: Greetings Al, Your guest list is becoming impressive (and I am not referring to the dyke's sister). Sam is dead right, in the name of an "affirmative action policy" men are really handed out a

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

raw deal. I am suffering from the same in Business School. Since "teamwork" is supposed to be key in organizations of the future, Teams of men and women are formed for graded assignments. Believe me, not one deserves to be in Business School on merit. Especially in Finance they are all lost, the professor should not be blamed if he thinks he's talking an alien language! Since our (the men's) grade is also on the line, the "Ladies" are secure in the knowledge that the men in the group will burn their night oil to get an A. Even in the exams, they somehow manage at least a B, how no one knows how, as the grading is purely at the discretion of the professors. What's the point, all of them will land jobs(because they are "equals", and "Oh, so deserving"!), and their kids will go to day care centers. They know they are not a patch on the men, and they love the fact that they are treated as equals, if not superiors(most Harvard Business School cases refrain from using "He", either it's "them" or "She").

PS: Al, even Dennice The Menace has gone P.C., His mother goes to work now!!²⁴³

Amit, you have put your finger on a point that is a common trick used by the feminists. They love to put women into a team with men. That leaves the men in a position where they have to carry the women along in order to succeed themselves. It has become so common anymore that most men do not even realize that it is happening. In the military they do that all the time. Can you imagine a unit of women trying to go up against a unit of men? It never happens. They always intersperse the females into both groups so that their weakness will be covered up. In every case that studies have been done, females have demonstrated a complete inferiority in performance of military combat tasks. What has been the answer to this by the military? To stop running studies! They bury or ignore the old studies and proceed as if they never existed.

Feminism is a cause built up with smoke and mirrors, lies and myths. The unfortunate thing is that the results of feminism are not merely lies and myths, but instead abandoned children, broken families and chaos in our society.

There is very little that is going to be tolerated, of traditional America, by the Leftist media in the future. Every part of the media is under constant pressure to change, in order to

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

more closely align itself with the PC ideal. A stay-at-home Mom in a major syndicated comic strip, stands out like a sore thumb to the Leftist feminists. How dare the author of that strip defy their will?!

Most Americans don't even realize that freedom of speech in newspapers and television is a complete myth. The technique that the Leftists use is to allow someone who is not PC to say a few words, and then have 3 or more PC pit bulls attack everything that he says. Then, when someone who is promoting the PC line is on, he is unopposed, or opposed in a "straw man" fashion that is so weak that it easily torn apart, and therefore really is promotion rather than opposition. I defy anyone to find a single occurrence of an anti-feminist having his say unopposed, on mainstream television during the last decade. Rush Limbaugh is the closest thing I can think of, and he purchased his own time! Of course it must be kept in mind that he only attacked the lesbian side of feminism, late at night, where most people would never see him. Also, it is important to remember that he is a quasi-feminist who actually supports many of the basic tenants of the feminist movement. The media has no place in it for those who are not PC! How very limited is any so-called free speech that has no access to the media! If it were not for the Internet, free speech would be dead.

-Al-

Name: Vana again

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-03-01 19:31:00

Comments: Al, I just read the two new articles you posted this month. I honestly have to wonder why you even live in this country. If you lived in Monaco, taxes would be 3% of your income. Hell, if you lived on the Virgin islands, you would pay no taxes. If you lived in practically any part of Latin America, no one would mind your chauvanism (plus low taxes). Well, I understand you've got a job here and all, but I hope you raised your kids to learn another language, so that they could move some nicer country. I personally, don't have a problem with you here or anything like that. But come on, for the sake of your own happiness, why do you (and all other really right wing people) even bother with this country? You guys

are not supposed to wait for the government to change its laws to accomodate you (that's what leftists do).²⁴⁴

I suppose you should be pitied for writing something so absurd, as if it were serious. However, my guess is that you have put a lot of work into your intentional ignorance, so pity may not be the appropriate response. In any case let us look at your offering.

You wonder why I live in this country? Such arrogance is hardly to be believed. My ancestors have walked this land for over 350 years. My people have built this land, creating from an untamed wilderness, filled with savages, the greatest nation that has ever graced this planet. So, this land is my rightful inherantence. That is why I live here.

I do not care what the people in Monaco pay in taxes, or anything else about a country that is nothing but a tourist trap and has fewer people in it than a decent suburb does. (29,712 people in 1992.) You think that I should give up my land, still the greatest on earth, in order to move to a French speaking minor gnat of a nation, with less than three-quarters of a square mile of land? The British Virgin Islands have even less population. Perhaps YOU would like to move to Red China, where your views are more in keeping with their traditional politics, and their population is even greater than the US? Such a line of "reasoning" as you propose, is fit for the dumpster, and you know it. So, we will leave it where it belongs.

It is interesting that you are in such support of paying half your money in taxes, fees, and fines, and you find opposition to any further increase in those thefts of our money to be way out of line. How is it that you are outraged by anyone wishing to keep a fair share of his own money? What gives you the right, through the government with which you are obviously sympathetic, to touch one penny of my money for your agenda? Nothing! That is what. And your anger at my objection to being robbed clearly shows your true designs.

I am striving to preserve this nation so my children, and grandchildren, will not have to learn another language but can continue to speak English as their forefathers did. It is Leftists like you that are trying overturn that situation.

It is so gratifying to realize that you, in spite of your absurd suggestions, don't have a problem with me staying here in my own country which was built by folks very much like

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

myself. How very generous of you to say so. And your simulated concern for my happiness, though dripping with sarcasm, is just as gratifying. But since you asked, let me tell you why I "bother with this country."

This country has led the world in scientific advancement. This country has a history of freedom for my people. This country has traditionally opposed those who, like yourself, have striven to create totalitarian oppression of those same people. This country still has the potential to return to the ideals of its golden age and to recover from the overthrow of its government by the Leftists in the 1960s. That is why I bother with this country, and always will.

YOU want to tell ME what Leftists do? Take a good look at the Bolshevik revolution. Look at the 20 million people they slaughtered even BEFORE Stalin began racking up his really serious murder numbers. Look at the slaughter every Communist government has been guilty of whenever it came to full power. Leftists do not have a history of waiting for anything. The only thing that kept them from killing their enemies in the USA was the fact that those who opposed their Leftist ideals were still in the majority. They were forced to work slowly, as they have done, not because that is what Leftists want to do, but because that was the only road open to them. I know the Leftists very well. Truth is perhaps the thing most repugnant to them, because it is a great danger to their cause.

You think that I am "really right wing." That assertion shows very clearly where you are coming from. What I propose would be supported by close to 100% of our founding fathers. If they disagreed at all, they would be even farther to "the Right" than I am. Because of the Leftist revolution in the 1960s our nation has moved so far into the radical Leftist camp that the founding fathers seem to be radical Right wing wackos. That is what I am fighting against! If you took the average man or woman on the street in the 1950s, you would find that they would line up very closely with what I have written on my page. Again, that demonstrates the drastic, and destructive changes that have occurred in our nation since the 1960s. When compared with the vast majority of historical American thought, I am far more mainstream than yourself. And you ask ME why I bother with this country?

One additional point on the Leftists, they most certainly did not wait for the laws to accommodate them. They were

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

actively breaking laws throughout the 1960s, rioting and disturbing the peace continually. They closed down schools, and disrupted every event and institution that they could. As I said, the only thing stopping them from outright military action was that the other side was stronger. The problem with those of my ilk, was that they were too passive, and caring. They did not want to seem to be thoughtless and heartless. They wanted the other side to be heard. What they never realized was that once the Leftists got into power, the majority opinion would never again be given the opportunity to be expressed openly in the mass media. We have been conquered, but not yet subdued.

I stand with George Washington, Thomas Jefferson and others of the founding fathers in promoting true Americanism, devoid of the philosophy of Karl Marx. Those of the Left, like yourself, who have undermined this great nation are always angered when anyone points out the fact that they have done so. No matter. We of what is labeled "the Right," who were once considered middle of the road, but who are staunch Americans, patriots all, will continue to oppose you until you have been overcome. That hopefully makes it clear to you why we bother with this country, and what our intentions are. -Al-

Name: Paul

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Scotland

Time: 2000-03-03 00:56:00

Comments: Your last reply was absolutely great Al. I too am sick of being labeled a fascist by certain people because I dare to be anti-feminist, anti-Communist and definitely anti-abortion. Then there are others who label me an extreme leftist because I want to see a "United states of Europe" based closely on the original principles of the U.S.! I am stuck in the middle and seemingly cannot win, but one day when we have won all our causes, and feminist's have to answer for the slaughter of millions of innocent children and the destruction of true democracy we can look back and be proud that we were the original few who dared stand up for what is right against tyranny.²⁴⁵

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

Thank you Paul! I am already proud to be one of those standing up for what is right, and I am happy to have you standing with me.

-Al-

Name: Carolyn Flores

Website: Date Rape Story

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Portland, OR

Time: 2000-03-05 17:33:00

Comments: Al, as you know I think your writings on the subject of feminism (or should I say, anti-feminism) are outstanding. However, I am wondering how you feel about feminism as it relates to the problem of false accusations of rape? This issue is of particular interest to me and I don't see it specifically addressed on your site. I'd be interested to know your thoughts on this subject.²⁴⁶

Welcome back Carolyn. I have noticed that feminists are as duplicitous on the subject of rape as they are on sexual harassment and other issues. They only care about such things when it increases their power, and otherwise they do not care at all. Whether or not there actually was a rape, matters little to them either. It was quite an education, watching the feminist hypocrites dodge and weave to avoid dealing with the fact that Bill Clinton, a man determined to increase the feminists' power, was admittedly guilty of what they have for years been describing as sexual harassment with Monica, and he was also accused of rape by a woman (and women never lie about rape, according to the feminists). The feminists disappeared. They could not be found. But let an ordinary man be falsely accused of rape and the feminists are all over him, screaming for his hide. It is clear from their actions that, to the feminist, women do not matter nor do men. The only thing that matters is the increase of their power over the citizens of this land.

-Al-

Name: alli

Website: [dismal desire]

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: hell

Time: 2000-03-08 06:57:00

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

Comments: this can't be serious. feminists being encouraged to have abortions? lol.²⁴⁷

While you are enjoying your idiotic laugh, whether out loud or otherwise, perhaps you might try using the area of your anatomy between your ears for a change, even though it is probably terribly atrophied due to lack of use. Can you find one other group of people on earth who promotes abortion more than the feminists do? Of course not. Abortion is a feminist sacrament, which is fiercely defended by these children hating totalitarians. They promote abortion as a "woman's right" as if killing children is the most natural thing in the world. The right for a woman to slaughter children in the womb is just as much of a right to feminists as are "life", liberty and the pursuit and happiness. (I had to put that life in quotes, because feminists are hedging on that one pretty badly.)

Think of it! A RIGHT to KILL:

- Not to kill in self defense, which is, if you thought about it for a moment, what a baby would be justified in doing, if he could kill his executioner "doctor," or the mother of his who is trying to kill him. Of course no feminist ever thinks about it that way, at least not for very long.
- Not to kill an enemy invader, as a soldier would but to kill their very own child.
- Not to kill a criminal, as an execution would be, where a man who is guilty of taking another's life is justly punished, but to kill the most innocent creature on earth, an unborn baby.

If that is not encouragement to have abortions, nothing could be. By way of comparison, the handful of back street abortions, were very few in number before the feminists did their work. The tens of millions of dead babies grow larger in number each year, and that is all on the shoulders of the feminist. I imagine you are ROTFL over that bloody fact. Why is it, do you suppose, that in movies you always find the villain Laughing Out Loud maniacally when innocent people are being murdered?

-Al-

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

Name: Veteran's Wife

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Pennsylvania

Time: 2000-03-08 09:07:00

Comments: After it finally dawned on me, (June 98) that Women's Lib isn't,,, that feminism's unnatural, it's just a plain old sham and a scam... Since then, have been able to comprehend (at least some) books and essays, which previously, I'd considered way above my league. Oh, the Freedom--being able to concentrate, to be as God created--it's wonderful. 'Am NEVER bored. And yes, contrary to the whinings from pundits-of-peeve, a wife can (if she chooses to) have time to think--and keep a reasonably clean house, and cook reasonably palatable meals.²⁴⁸

It is always a joy to have you drop in and share your thoughts. Imagine that! Being free to think and reason, to be intelligent, and still be a good housewife. That is the truth that the feminists have always tried to hide. They have painted every woman who ever existed in the past, who was a good wife and mother, as being stupid, unthinking, enslaved, unhappy and beaten down. How absurd! And most Americans today sit still and let their mothers, grandmothers and all their female ancestors before them, be slandered unmercifully in this fashion. It is disgusting. I am so thankful when women like yourself come forward and set the record straight. Thank you!

-Al-

Name: Mr Hanky

Website:

Referred by: Yahoo!

From: Europe

Time: 2000-03-15 12:01:00

Comments: Howdy, I'd like to know if you got some anti-feminist quotes for me from famous people. In my class the majority are women and some of them are feminists. We (men) are constantly being discriminated in our class. They hang feminist cartoons on the walls and I'd like to respond to that with some anti-feminist quotes

(or cartoons). I'd be pleased if you could give me some quotes or something. Thx in advance, Mr Hanky Btw, love yar site!²⁴⁹

Name: Amit

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfing On In

From:

Time: 2000-03-15 20:34:00

Comments: r Al, This was a headline in one of our national Dailies: Sister trio set to march into Army Pankaj Jaiswal (Lucknow, March 15) COME SEPTEMBER, Rakhi, Roli and Ruchi Chauhan are expected to be directly commissioned as officers in the Indian Army. The three sisters from Lakhimpur-Kheri today left their adopted city of Lucknow for Chennai to join the Officers' Training Academy (OTA) there. The Chauhan trio is among 51 girls who came through the Staff Selection Board (SSB) examination this time. Rakhi, Roli and Ruchi will be the first set of three sisters to get direct commission into the Indian Army, and that too through the same course (Women's Special Entry Scheme) at OTA. When M.S. and Usha Chauhan pip ranks on their daughters' shoulders at the passing out parade (POP) this September, it will be a very, very special moment for the family. Captain Mridul Kumar Singh (28), the brother of Rakhi, Roli and Ruchi, won a Sena Medal for his role in Operation Vijay in Kargil. Indeed, it was Mridul, currently posted in Bikaner, who had inspired the girls to opt for the Army as a career. Papa Chauhan, a Lakhimpur-Kheri farmer, had himself been keen to join the Army long ago. Now finds his ambition fulfilled through his four children. Said mama Chauhan: "We made sure that our three daughters did whatever they wanted to." Rakhi (24), Roli (22), and Ruchi (20) were educated at St Bosco Convent, Lakhimpur-Kheri, and graduated from Yuvraj Dutt PG College there. Rakhi also studied personnel management at Lucknow University. "All girls have hidden talents. One must discover, identify and nurture them. Girls must stop being liabilities to their parents. When they grow up, they should support their parents the way boys are expected to," Rakhi said today. Said Mrs Chauhan: "They should bring up their daughters so that they can contribute to the nation and fulfil their ambitions." Recounts Ruchi, proudly: "When we were preparing with boys who wanted to join the Army, people mocked us. But our par-

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

ents asked us to ignore their comments, which we did. And today we are achievers and they are nowhere." Of course Mrs Chauhan forgets that her son Mridul nearly lost his life after suffering from multiple gunshot wounds during the Kargil War, and that her daughters will never risk their lives in active combat. To this she said "My daughters are as brave and strong as any man, and will prove their worth to the Nation when the Time comes.

..... What do you think Al, isn't it hilarious?²⁵⁰

Amit, I do find it ridiculous. Feminism is interested in the appearance of equality, not the reality of equality. The fact that these girls are in the military makes them soldiers, not performing the job of being a soldier, because they cannot do it properly, and never will be able to. They will disrupt the male bonding that is normal in a military organization and be a perpetual distraction to the men in their unit. They will not only personally perform at a subnormal level for a soldier, but they will also cause the men around them to perform at a lower level than they would otherwise.

It is a sad commentary that the parents of these 3 sisters have bought into the lie that being a wife and mother is not contributing to the nation. It is through the propaganda that promotes such deception that feminism is able to spread so far and wide.

-Al-

Name: Giselle

Website: Transgender Links from Yahoo

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-03-18 14:03:00

Comments: This is a serious question: Where do those who have surgically changed their sex fit in your view? Should a born woman who has taken hormones to develop a more masculine body still be a housewife? Should a genetic male who has surgery and hormones to become indistinguishable from a genetic female still go out into the workforce?²⁵¹

Those who have surgically, and chemically, deformed themselves in hope of becoming that which they are not able to become, are pitiful, sad human beings. They, like those

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

who suffer from other forms of homosexuality, or those who suffer from pedophilia, and other perversions do not fit into any normal society. They are in need of help which falls outside the scope of normal society. As I have repeatedly stated in this guest book, society cannot be created and shaped around the bizarre, the perverted or the strange. Society must set its rules and standards based upon normal human behavior. That is why feminism is a failure and universally causes damage to any society which embraces it. Feminism is focused upon the abnormal, masculine minded female, while ignoring the normal, feminine minded female.

My page is focused on what a society should do to make the largest number of men and women happy. In order to do that, we must set aside the demands of the abnormal men and women, or we will suffer the destruction or loss of our society. The evidence is already in. As we have distorted our society to make it comfortable for the lesbian, we have made it very difficult for the normal heterosexual woman. As is always the case with the Leftist causes, the very small percentage of society which has been left out, is used as justification for completely dismantling the system and building a new system which promotes some minority of people, and leaves out the huge majority of people. To any sane mind that approach is totally irrational.

-Al-

Name: Kristina

Website: n/a

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: NYC

Time: 2000-03-18 20:24:00

Comments: Women *want* to be dominated? Women *want* to be put down, denied citizenship and independence, and treated like nothing more than sex objects? And you're blaming women for, basically, all of society's problems (which, since we live in a male-dominated society, have been caused by men). You come off sounding like a sexually repressed, insecure little boy.²⁵²

Kristina, this is what they call creating a "straw man." You list off a bunch of items, some of which are outright lies, and others which are distortions of fact. Then, since nobody will agree with that false straw man, (not even me!) then you

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

have no trouble knocking him down, and thereby doing away with the idea (my web page) you are attacking, as being totally ridiculous. Nice try but that tactic is a feeble weapon against anyone who is paying attention at all. Then, as a final topping, a dash of name calling is thrown on, to complete the tirade. Rather than discuss what "you come off sounding like," let's look at your dishonest and distorted points one by one:

1. Women want to be dominated? While there exists a whole category of sexual deviation where some women, who call themselves "femslaves", actually do want to be physically and emotionally dominated in a relationship, they are not the norm. The normal woman does not like to be dominated in that sense. The normal woman does like a male that is a leader, but one who takes her opinions, needs and desires into consideration at all times. If you wish to distort the meaning of the words, you can equate leadership to domination, but that would be dishonest. They are not the same thing in reality. Leadership brings the best out in others, and makes them feel good about themselves. Domination crushes the ego, and makes them feel bad about themselves. A good husband who is the head of his family, and a leader, never crushes the ego of his wife or children. He does all that he can to promote high self esteem in all members of the family.
2. Women *want* to be put down? This one is so far out of bounds that it can only be labeled a complete falsehood, with no connection to my web page. I never said, anywhere on my web page or my guest book, that women want to be put down. In fact I have clearly pointed out that women are sensitive, thoughtful creatures who should be treasured and cared for, listened to and appreciated. Never, ever, would I promote the idea of putting women down!
3. Women *want* to be denied citizenship? Again there is nothing on my web page or in my guest book that would suggest that women want to be denied citizenship, or that men should deny them citizenship. They have been citizens of this country from its inception, and always will be. It is absurd to suggest otherwise. Prior to the 19th amendment, women did not have the

vote, but they were citizens. I think that is the way it should still be. Some women agree with that, and some disagree. However, nobody that I know of is suggesting that women should be denied citizenship.

4. Women *want* to be denied independence? You don't say independence from what. All people would like to be free. There are some facts of life that must be faced however. The term "independently wealthy" applies to only a small minority of people. Other than that exclusive club, all people are dependent upon either someone else, or working at a job to make ends meet.

You may want many things that would be destructive to have. For example most men, if not all, have a natural instinct to "chase women". Several industries, which are quite solvent by the way, rely on this tendency. In a stable society, it is destructive for men to give in to this tendency. Therefore, they may want to do it, but if they are good husbands, they will hold that tendency in check, and keep their desires restrained. The same is true of an "independent" woman. If she dumps her responsibilities in order to run as she pleases, it will be destructive to her family and her society. It is self-discipline which allows an adult male or female to set their own wants aside to create happiness for their families, and thereby create happiness for themselves. A stable person will do this. A destructive one will not.

5. Women *want* to be treated like nothing more than sex objects? Here is a distortion of what I said. I never said that women ONLY wanted to be treated like sex objects. You twisted what I said. Many women do wish to be thought of as sex objects. Not only as sex objects, but as sex objects nonetheless. Any woman who wears a short skirt, or a low cut blouse is going to generate many sexual thoughts in nearly all the men that they meet throughout the entire time they are dressed that way. Unless they are of subnormal intelligence, they know this is true. They could avoid being thought of as a sex object by dressing modestly, but they chose not to. Therefore, they must desire to be thought of as sex objects.

This is a basic aspect of the sexual interplay between humans. Females are "hunted" by males, and

therefore they wish to be attractive "prey". A man aggressively goes after a woman, and a woman attempts to appear desirable and worthy of being gone after. In the animal kingdom the same type of interplay goes on continually. Just because a woman desires to be a sex object at one level, never means that is all she is, or all that she wants to be. And just because a man views her as a sex object at one level, does not mean that is the only thing he sees about her, or that is all she is to him. Men and women are complex beings, and they have many compartments. To identify a single compartment for what it is, does not in any way remove the importance of the other compartments.

6. You're blaming women for, basically, all of society's problems. Nonsense! I do not blame women for any of society's problems. What blame that I do assign on my web page, is blame to feminists, both men and women! I do not even blame feminists for "all of society's problems." I do blame them for the problems that result from children being abandoned by their mothers, in favor of a career. Things like teen crime, school shootings and other children related issues are feminist related and only a dishonest person would deny that feminism played at least part role in them. I also blame them for inserting women into the military, police force and fire fighting departments because women weaken each of these organizations and will ultimately cost human lives. There are a great many problems in our society that have nothing to do with feminism. Many of them are caused by Leftists, who happen to be feminists as well, but their stand on feminism is not what led to these other problems, but rather it is their Marxist views and activities that are at fault.
7. Since we live in a male-dominated society, basically, all of society's problems have been caused by men. Men certainly are not perfect and they have made some very serious mistakes. For one they gave women the vote, which has driven our country right into the arms of socialism. If men had never given the vote to women, feminism could never have inflicted its terrible wounds upon our children, and our society. That was indeed men's fault. While more and more of

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

the blame is being correctly shifted over to the feminists, as they have more time to work on destroying our society, there is still plenty of things that men can be justly faulted for. I have no problem with men being justly accused of wrongdoing, why is it that feminists don't accept the blame for what they have done do you suppose?

Your final comment is not worthy of reply, for it is based upon ignorance and nothing more than an attempt to sully the character of someone with whom you disagree. You should raise yourself up above such tactics and deal with facts and ideas, leaving name calling and insult to those weak minded folks who have nothing else to offer, unless you are actually one of them.

-Al-

Name: Melissa R

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-03-20 16:27:00

Comments: Hey Al. I just wanted to add a message to your book. This is sure to get the feminists in an uproar.

In 1973, a sexology researcher, Dr. John Money, in a well received and much publicized research paper, argued that gender roles are plastic and formed chiefly by conditioning. His paper centered on an anonymous child whom the researcher referred to as "John". When John was only a few months old, he required an operation to repair a botched circumcision. The operating surgeon accidentally amputated John's penis. Under the doctors' advice, the parents allowed them to make the child a girl (as is often done in similar cases, because it is easier to fashion female than male genitals). The doctors removed his testicles and remaining penis and surgically constructed a vagina. John's parents raised the child as a girl, and even later, gave her female hormone treatments never telling her the truth of the tragic accident. Even female psychiatrists were engaged to help reinforce the child's female identity.

Dr. Money wrote a paper about the child, ignoring a number of warning signals, and reported at an early age he (now a she) had well adapted to the new gender role. Feminist researchers, writers,

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

and the popular media, cited the case of John as glowing proof that gender roles were purely the result of environment rather than biology. In 1997, Dr. Milton Diamond of the University of Hawaii-Manoa in Honolulu published an in depth follow up on the case of John. They revealed a startling turn of events in John's development.

Even as a child, John repeatedly attempted to urinate standing up. His mother tried to show him how to put on makeup but he wanted to imitate his father shaving instead. He rejected dolls and dresses and sought the company of boys and trucks. At the age of 12, he was given hormone supplements to grow breasts. He grew intensely unhappy and considered suicide. Finally with no knowledge of his real sexual identity, at the age of 14, he refused to continue the hormone supplements and simply refused to live as a girl any longer. At that point, his tearful parents told him of the surgeon's tragic mistake. Although he was understandably bitter, his dominant emotion was relief. He said, "For the first time I understand who and what I am." John requested male hormone shots, had a mastectomy and ultimately, a phalloplasty to fashion a penis from skin grafts. John later married, adopted children, and is quite well adjusted.

All in all Al this story of John proves that females and males are not equal. It is not the environment which shapes who you are but purely biology. No matter how hard the media or the feminists push the idea that girls only like dolls when they are shown them, it still shows true what I had to say. John is a prime example. Thank you for letting me share this with you.²⁵³

Thank you for taking the time to share this with us!

-Al-

Name: Vet's Wife

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfed On In

From: Pennsylvania

Time: 2000-03-23 12:54:00

Comments: Dear Al, Just read some accounts of women who had abortions--and of their boyfriend's bailing on them afterwards. The stories were sad, but not surprising.

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

WOMYNKARE

*Th' ol' lady,
best stay on th' pill—
'cause if she don't,
her butt, to the mill;
an' 'ey, she works,,,
send her th' bill.*²⁵⁴

Abortion is nothing but an attempt to use murder to wipe out mistakes, and to avoid responsibility. For many men they act like they are very caring and understanding as they hold their girlfriend's hand through the abortion process. Then, when it is over, they breath a sigh of relief and hit the road. The fact that a human life has been taken, a human heart has been halted, is lost in the process. Because the child has not yet made its appearance outside of its incubation chamber, it is considered to not yet exist. And the "fathers" who so intently pretend to care about the "mothers" before the abortion, often drop the pretense afterwards, and simply walk away.

-Al-

Name: Love

Website: candyflesh

Referred by: Just Surfed On In

From:

Time: 2000-03-31 20:00:00

Comments: now, i'm really not sure why i'd want to become a man, if they are this jealous of women. are you afraid to post this entry in your guestbook? i thought so.²⁵⁵

You cannot "become a man," (unless you are a male child who will one day grow up), so it is just as well that you do not want to. Respecting the differences of women is not being "jealous" of women.

Your entry is essentially empty, devoid of content. Why would anyone be afraid of such a lame attack? Read the earlier entries in my guest book if you want to at least see some real efforts to attack my web page.

The only entries that I delete from my guest book are ones that contain obscene language. Even those are not always deleted. If I have time, I will edit them, rather than deleting them, if they contain something worth discussing. -Al-

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

Name: Sidney

Website: Fabrications In My Ears

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-03-31 20:30:00

Comments: Dude somehow I figure that there was something seriously wrong with your childhood or something. There's something that obviously is making you think that women are inferior to women. You need to wake up, women are just as good as men if not better. Sure you can go on and on about how women are the causes of school shootings and such, with your analytical writings that are filled with a bunch of mumbo-jumbo. You're gonna be wrong in the eyes of the majority of the people that read this. Your views may be 'right' in your head. But if you stepped outside of yourself, you'd think "whoa look at what an a_____ I am." Peace out dude. I hope you wake up and realize some of the things you're actually saying.²⁵⁶

Yes, by the thinking of today, there was something seriously wrong with my childhood. I had both of my real, biological parents living in my home with me. I had parents that cared about me and supervised my activities when I was growing up. I had parents that taught me respect for my parents and for my elders in general. Yes, by your feminist standards, I had a very wrong childhood, filled with love, rules and attention.

As far as inferiority goes, I have discussed this over and over again in my guest book. I do think that women are physically inferior to men for sports, lifting and other things. It is not a vague "some reason" that makes me think that. It is fact, pure and simple, and everyone who has the slightest open mind agrees with that. So, in some things women are not nearly as "good as men" are. It would be dishonest to think otherwise. When it comes to raising children however, women are far superior to men and that makes them better than men in that area. The point is that women are different than men and therefore should be treated differently than men. Pretty straight forward.

Yes, I am sure that you find all reasoning that you disagree with, or cannot understand, to be "mumbo-jumbo. As I

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

continue to point out, and folks like you continue to let sail right over their heads, I do not blame women for school shootings, or the other problems of society. I blame only feminists, and that includes many men as well as women. When feminists leave their children unattended in order to have a career, they are responsible for the results of their actions. Your whining about it will not change the validity of that fact.

Whether I am going to be “wrong in the eyes of the majority of the people that read this” or I am going to be right in their eyes, matters not a bit to me. What matters to me is whether I am right or wrong with respect to reality. Most people who read this will probably be folks who sit down nearly every night for their brainwashing session from their television. Anyone who is reckless enough to do that, is not someone whose opinion I am going concern myself with. When you intentionally expose yourself to propaganda you are going to be manipulated into the “party line” point of view. That means you give up your right to form your own views and you turn your will over to those in control of the propaganda.

If you compared my views, with those of the average people before the leftist take over of our country, you would find that my views would be mostly middle of the road. You do not care about that fact any more than I care about what the majority of the brainwashed masses today think. What matters is the truth, not public opinion.

It is amazing that people have reached the point today, where someone who actually thinks for himself is considered such a threat. You called me a vulgar name because I think for myself. You are acting like a lemming, a sheep. You are terrified of being different than the crowd. Anyone who does not go along with the group is bad to you. You must blindly attack independent thinkers as the enemy.

Unfortunately for you, it is not I who is asleep and who needs to wake up to realize what I am saying. You are sound asleep, letting others tell you what to think and say. You have been assimilated.

-Al-

Name: tremor

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfing On In

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

From: illinois

Time: 2000-04-15 00:42:00

Comments: hmmm.....INTERSTING... you know,its awefully UN-COMMON in this age to find people who dont live by that PC garbage. I like your site. let the feminists have their way.. they are a dying breed.. I LOVE WOMEN but and I DO NOT think ANYONE is SUPERIOR we are just DIFFERENT..where would we be if it wasnt for men though..CULTURE,TECHNOLOGY ect.. we had a great influence where would all these d*kes be? MUD HUTS? WORSE.. CAVES? in truth WOMEN do contribute alot to civilizastion BUT we cant live without each other.²⁵⁷

Well said! Thanks for sharing your thoughts.

-Al-

Name: *kara*

Website:

Referred by: From a Friend

From:

Time: 2000-04-15 18:28:00

Comments: my father and my brother are both male chauvinists, and i am a feminist. you portray feminists uncorrectly. you make them seem like harsh, heartless, unfeeling, destructive sharks. i beleive that men are equal to women, and that they should have the same role in society. does that mean i support abortion? NO. and its often due to sexist pigs such as YOU that women get abortions. their boyfriends/husbands dont feel as though they want the responsibility of a child, so they encourage the woman to have an abortion so they will not have to deal with it. yes, there are women who get abortions so they wont have the responsibility. that does not mean that the "feminist religion" forced it on them!!!! you also blame feminism for divorce. well, yes. feminism has taught females not to take abuse and rape from their husbands, and to LEAVE if they need to. so, would that mean that you support domestic violence? there are so many loop holes in your chauvinism... as for your theory that feminism makes people dumber, thats BULL, im afraid to say. just because someone is feminist does not mean that they will have an abortion just to pursue their careers. i am sure there are people that do, but well, you stereotype. a lot. BUT, you being a

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

chauvinist, its not that surprising. you also think that women WANT to be sex objects!!!! what is wrong with you!?!? women wear short skirts and high heels because of society's depiction of women as sex objects; they want to feel attractive, yes, but they dont want to be viewed as "sex objects". what is a sex object, anyway? anyone can be a sex object. women are just often portrayed that way because of society's twisted perception of what how women should be. if a woman wants to be sex object, she should. if she doesnt, she shouldnt. i think that is true feminism. i dont think it has anything to do with being a homemaker, or being a lawyer, its all about what the woman herself truely wants to do with her life. i think a homemaker can be a feminist. i also happen to know a lot of feminist men. yes, feminist men! what a concept! and YES, i know men who want a woman to go out and work, and they can be the stay-at-home dad. ever think of that? you say that your chauvinism 'respects' women. hypocrit. yes, you respect them sooo much, that is why you openly write about them being sex objects. and to say that women are better at raising children then men are is a ridiculous stereotype. there ARE women who have abandoned their families, you know (and it wasnt because of the "feminist movement"), and men are left to care for the children. these kids are just as likely as any other kids with single parent families to grow up to be "violent", or whatever it was you tried to put the blame on single parent mom's for. my parents are divorced because my mom wouldnt take crap from my dad. i'll be honest, my mom is definately not the best mother. but because she isnt, does that mean i will grow up to be a serial killer? NO , it DOESNT. i happen to be very intelligent, and although you DO make SOME interesting points on your webpage, your discrimination against both men AND women is degrading to both sexes. i hope that one day you will eventually realize your ignorance, and grow from it.

//kara

ps-i truely pity your wife...(if you actually have one, that is.)²⁵⁸

It is interesting that you have such a low opinion of your father and your brother. It probably says more about you than anything else you could say.

It is clear that you have not read very much of my web page since you make the mistake of trying to convince me that there are men feminists. I have had to point that very

thing out to the dull witted feminists who continually fail to make the distinction between women, and feminists. My page is pro-women and anti-feminist, whether the feminist is male or female, matters not at all. It is the destructive philosophy of feminism that I am against, not women.

Feminism is the driving force behind abortion. Whether you personally are in support of abortion or not is of no consequence. It does not relieve you from your responsibility for supporting a cause that has slaughtered over 30 million children in the womb. While there have always been men who are scum and willing to let their babies be killed by abortion, they never joined together and created a political machine which promoted legalized abortion, and which caused abortion to actually become legal. Feminists did that, and feminists must take the full responsibility for their actions. If you are a feminist, you are responsible.

The feminist religion is quite flagrant in its promotion of abortion to women, as if it were their right to be able to kill their children. While women may not be "forced" to have an abortion by the feminists, they are thousands of times more likely to have an abortion today because they have been brainwashed by the feminists into believing that it is not a bad thing to kill their child. You can pussy foot around that issue all you want but the fact is that abortion is legal today because of feminism and for no other reason. Feminism stands guilty of the murder of over 30 million babies.

You create a simple and stupid straw man in trying to claim that all, or even a significant number, of the divorces that the vast majority of marriages today are ending in, are because of rape and abuse. That is absurd and you know it. Even with the divorces, and women leaving their homes there is more abuse today because of feminism than there ever was before. Men today are taught that women are tough. They can be soldiers, and cops, and firemen. Women are equal in every way with men. So, men who believe that nonsense, have started punching women out, like they would a man. And the feminists go around acting like they have done those poor ladies a favor. That is pretty sick.

It appears from your post that you did not read many of the articles that you are trying to comment on. You say that feminism will not make the people of our civilization dumber, but you completely missed the reason why you are wrong. If the most intelligent women have careers instead of babies,

then their genes are lost to the gene pool. That will cause a downturn in the intelligence level of any society which embraces feminism. It is unavoidable. In the past, intelligent women had large families. Today, it is mostly the uneducated women who are having large families. The obvious result of this process is a gradual, but unavoidable, decrease in intelligence in the community.

Your rambling and disjointed statement on women being sex objects is muddy at best. A woman who wears short skirts is viewed as a sex object by the majority of men who look at her dressed like that. She would have to be stupid indeed not to realize that. As I have said many times before, women who dress as sex objects wish to be sex objects. That is not all they wish to be, but unless they are very stupid, they know that is what they are. Women can be very attractive without dressing like a street walker. There is a real difference between beauty (being attractive) and playing to sexual arousal.

It is a shame that you spent no time reading my guest book before you wasted your verbiage upon such repetition. I have repeatedly said that feminist men are as bad as feminist women. I have said that single men are not better parents than single women. I often wonder if all feminists share a single brain cell and pass it back and forth among themselves, because they all say the same thoughtless things.

I am not surprised that your parents are divorced. Viewing the rest of your comments I am forced to think that your comment that your mother was taking "crap" from your dad is as ridiculous as the rest. I was not there to see for myself, so we will have to pass by that single event, which is completely beside the point of my web page.

You make the same silly mistake that virtually all the feminists do. You think that if you can point out one case where kids turned out normally after a divorce, or after a mother abandons her children for a career, then that means that all kids will. That is the same as saying that just because one smoker does not die from smoking related illness, no smoker will die from smoking related illness. The fact is that kids who are abandoned by working mothers, on average are going to be worse off than those who were not. Get over it, because it is not going away.

Perhaps, oh very intelligent one, you will one day be able to couple some education, and some wisdom together with

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

your massive mental capabilities and realize that all people who lived before 1970 were not morons. For thousands of years humans have realized that there are differences between the sexes. Men and women are not the same. They have different capabilities. The vast majority of women are infinitely more adept at dealing with children than men are. The extremely small number of men who can effectively be a "Mr. Mom" are not worth considering. As you would know if you had bothered to read my guest book, I have made it clear repeatedly that society cannot logically shape itself around the miniscule minority at the expense of the vast majority.

There is nothing degrading in being a mother or a housewife. My wife is a just such a person, and so is my mother. My grandmothers, and their mothers were as well. Each and every one of these women was honored and respected by their families and their communities. What is degrading is for someone like you to come along and claim that they were somehow less than you are. That is insulting and just plain wrong. The hand that rocks the cradle has more power than any other in the long run.

Contrary to your confused assertion, wisdom is not ignorance. If it were, you be wisdom itself.

My wife always gets a good laugh at the unthinking and unknowing feminists who mockingly extend their pity towards her. Since she is very happy, and after nearly 24 years of marriage, she finds your comment ridiculous and bred from ignorance. Save your pity for yourself. You are the one who will have to live your life under the yoke of feminist bondage. You will have to suffer the divorce, and collapsed relationships that feminism brings to it adherents. If you have children, they will suffer from your ignorance and neglect. If you do not have children you will remove your contribution to the gene pool of the future, and therefore will have nothing to say beyond your own selfish existence. I truly pity you.

-Al-

Name: Amit

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfing On In

From:

Time: 2000-04-15 21:23:00

Comments: Al, This message is for Sidney, the "DUDE" who wants to enlighten you (my, what impeccable English!). Hey Sid-

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

ney, if Women are equals, why don't they beat men in atleast something? I can swallow the argument that In vocations requiring Strength, Men dominate, but the Brains are supposed to be equal, so why not in chess? Maybe, because like the W NBA and the L PGA, they don't have a Ladies' only Chess Championship!!"²⁵⁹

Amit,

It is interesting that there is a separate category for female chess players, and while their play is quite good, it is always a little short of the play of the best men. The geniuses with the very highest IQ's are always men as well. Where women excel, feminism is trying to numerically diminish their presence, and where they are inferior, the feminists are trying to numerically increase their presence. When someone honestly answers for themselves the question, "Why do they do this?" Then and only then will they truly understand feminism for what it is. They will then see that feminism has nothing to do with promoting the status of women, or improving their lot in any way. It has absolutely nothing to do with improving our society in any way. It is nothing but a power play by a relatively small number of elitists and nothing more.

-Al-

Name: Love

Website: candyflesh

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-04-17 16:45:00

Comments: if you honestly think my entry was so empty, you're obviously too stupid to understand the parables of it. that's obvious by your little articles that try to sound reasonable and intelligent. you're not, and you're being mocked heavily for it. yes, we're all just laying back, knowing you'll die soon and we'll all lie easy knowing you cannot plague the internet with your childish crap any longer. really, using petty attacks to reply to your guestbook entries, without even notifying the entrante. i'm sure you live under the assumption that justified, but you have yet to prove it. i see young girls cutting your argument down, successfully, in your guestbook. you'd think an ardent chauvenist would see that as failure, but no, not a stupid one. the stupid man never sees when it's time to drop the flag, when it's time to save face. joke's on you, sweetheart (that's a sexual refer-

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

ence, don't let it get to your head). why not give up now like a good little boy?²⁶⁰

In my guest book I have to deal with all sorts of confused people. I get the adolescent child who parrots what her mother or her teacher has told her, and has not yet had the chance to think a real thought on her own yet. I get the brainwashed, hard core lemming, who is completely intent on following the rest of the fools over the cliff. I get the lesbian who is panting so profusely to become a man, that she no longer has any control over her own thinking process, but you are a special case.

Go back to my main web page and read what it says directly below the buttons for signing and reading the guest book. Too complicated for you? I will put it here for you so even you can find it:

I respond to all signers, so there is a great deal of additional material here!

Unless you are completely illiterate, that is notification in advance that if you enter anything in my guest book it will be responded to. That statement of intent has been there for close to two years. Even though you were so careless as to miss the warning clearly posted on my web page, if you had only bothered to read any of the entries in my guest book you would have noticed that each of them have been responded to from me. So, your accusations are as devoid of merit as are your points of "argument."

Coming from someone like yourself, the accusation of stupidity is a compliment. Not only do I "honestly think [your] entry was so empty" of real content, I will prove it! Let us look at your deep, profound, and parable filled entry:

now, i'm really not sure why i'd want to become a man, if they are this jealous of women. are you afraid to post this entry in your guestbook? i thought so.

As you can see, not only was I not afraid to post your entry once, but now it is up twice. That makes your last two sentences look pretty ridiculous, in addition to being demonstrably, and completely, wrong. That leaves only your first sentence for any consideration at all for content. I have al-

ready pointed out that there is no sane reason why you would want to become a man, since it is physically impossible. So that first phrase is either absurd, or insane, or both. The only thing left is your assertion that men are jealous of women. You support that accusation with no facts or arguments. There are not even any reasonable inferences that can be derived from it, because it is disconnected from reality. I am not jealous of women. I do not know of anyone who is. So, your statement is empty of meaning.

Since you frown on stupidity, it would do you well to remove your own and learn the definition of a parable. (Although that technically makes you ignorant rather than stupid, sometimes it is difficult to differentiate between the two.) It is a story that carries with it a moral. When the listener hears the story it will bring the moral into clearer focus and make it easier to remember in the future. For example the old story of The Boy Who Cried Wolf. That was a parable. Your post, on the other hand, had no story, no moral and no content. There was no parable, let alone "parables."

In my guest book you will often see young girls mimic what they heard in their school propaganda. While they, like you, love to call names and spit out cliches, they have no substance to their beliefs. They, like you, are so brainwashed that they could not see a fact if it bit them on the nose.

The feminist never fails to fall back upon the only weapon they really know how to use: name calling. You three times referred to me as "stupid," and when that was not going to be enough, mockingly referred to me as "sweetheart," and "little boy." You may think that is impressive, and perhaps to your adolescent friends it may be, but here you are not dealing with some inexperienced teenager. I know that I am of above average intelligence from IQ tests I have taken, technical training that I have both taken and given, and from numerous other independent sources. Therefore, calling me stupid only shows your own inability to judge intelligence. The other two attempts at insult, are nothing but an indication of your lack of ability to deal with the facts of my web page, and therefore you are reduced to name calling.

The feminist is always asking me to "give up," as if truth was just going to go away because they don't like it. Tough break lady, but that is not going to happen. Also, your feminist hatred came to the surface and exposed itself for a moment. That is always refreshing, because it lets others see

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

how sick your philosophy is. You wish me dead in hopes that my knowledge will disappear with me. But alas for you, truth is truth, and relies upon no one man to perpetuate it. A thousand years from now, when your feminist heroes will be unremembered, there will still be male chauvinists, and there will be women who are mothers and homemakers, and there is nothing that you can do about it. The joke is therefore on you!

-Al-

Name: Love

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-04-19 17:24:00

Comments: i'm just happy knowing i'm a better person than you. i'm very glad to know that i am not trying to repress other people. the most obvious thing that can be gathered from your page is that you are threatened by women. you claim that everything wrong with the world is the fault (and yes, you do place this much blame on it, it's impossible that you deny that) of women trying to achieve their highest potential. you claim that it's only natural that men work and women raise children. you seem ignorant to the fact that the world population is increasing steadily and if this is all every woman does, the world would be overpopulated beyond belief in a matter of years. that's a very obvious problem.

the majority of jobs that require hard labor are held by men. yes, men's bodies are better suited for this type of thing. but you know what? women are generally more balanced, more precise than men. this makes them better engineers, doctors, and anything else that requires a stable hand. now it's simply ridiculous to say that it's more natural for men to have these jobs. it's very obvious that the person more suited to the job should have it.

you know, perhaps your site could make some decent points if you weren't so caught up in trying to keep women at home, because yes, that makes it very obvious that you are threatened by women, probably because so many have achieved so much more than you.²⁶¹

You and President Clinton. You think you are better than everyone else because you "care." Your "goodness" is only

matched by your "humility." Upon what do you base this claim to being a better person? Because you are "not trying to repress other people." That claim is a complete falsehood. You are trying to repress anyone who wishes to live life in a traditional manner. You want to sue companies who promote family men over single women. You want to punish companies who do not hire or promote enough women to suit you. You want to disassemble any and all male institutions in order to promote your agenda. You want to take little girls who would be happy as homemakers and brainwash them into doing something else, anything else. That is repression! You think that because you are promoting the desires of the leftist women, that you are promoting the desires of all women. And you have such little regard for the women who wish to be homemakers, that you consider them absolutely nothing. They are non-persons to you because you claim you suppress no one, when in fact you suppress them.

And to make another point of clarification, while you are trying to repress people, I am not. I have never attempted to promote any law that would force women to stay at home. I have never encouraged any woman or man to sue anyone to make things be the way I feel they should be. I am only promoting the facts, and the logical results of those facts. I show that kids who are not supervised by their mothers, but are sent to day care, or left on their own, are worse off for it. That is a fact. If you choose to disagree with the facts, I am not going to get congress to pass laws to make you toe the line. I am not trying to repress people. Feminists are trying to repress people. I am trying to wake people up to the stupidity of feminism and the horrible price we are going to have to pay for embracing it.

While I am not trying to repress people and you are, I am not such a egomaniac to make the ridiculous statement that "I'm just happy knowing I'm a better person than you." What kind of person would make such a statement? Only a liberal. They are only concerned with fooling everyone into thinking of them as "better people," even though they don't care at all how many lives they destroy with their selfish and self righteous agenda.

It is simply outrageous that anyone would make the absurd claim that women could hold a candle to men, let alone be superior to them, in the fields of engineering or medical doctor. I, along with nearly anyone I know would welcome

fair competition in those fields, instead of what we have now. Now, the government insists that schools accept a certain number of women in those areas, regardless of their abilities. Anyone who has studied the evidence would realize that most women are not equipped for the engineering field. It has been overwhelmingly demonstrated by many tests, (see the book *Brain Sex*) that the female brain is completely inferior to the male brain in the areas of math, science and spatial perception. This is a scientific fact. It follows from that, that if a fair competition is held, the vast majority of the best engineers will be male: today, tomorrow and forever. A similar argument could be made for the profession of medical doctor. Fair competition, and offering the job to the best candidate is what the leftist, like you, is fighting so strongly against, all the time during which you dishonestly claim that you are fighting for "equal opportunity."

How can I be threatened by women? If you took the time to go through my guest book you would see that I have had to respond to that ridiculous charge over and over again. It would appear that you feminists are individually not capable of generating an original thought. I should just set up a copy and paste for your posts because seldom is there anything new. I am not threatened by women. What is a woman going to do? Is she going to take my job away from me? Not in this lifetime. There are a great number of men in my company who are doing a similar job as I am. Do you know how many women are doing it? One. That is it. Nation wide, from coast to coast, only one woman is doing the job. It is a high tech job that women do not naturally have the aptitude for. So, where is the competition that I am supposed to be afraid of? Where is the threat coming from? There is none. Professionally, women could never touch me. At home I have a wonderful wife who agrees with my views on the roles of men and women completely. She sees you as a very confused person. (I am saying it nicer than she did.) There is no threat at home. In fact there is no place in my life that I am threatened by women. So your claim, is completely bogus. At least you are consistent.

I blame feminism for a great many things. Of course I do not, as you falsely claim, blame it for everything that is wrong with our society. The vast majority of what is wrong with our society has come from the leftist takeover of our political, educational, and religious institutions and I certainly

would never deny that fact. Women who attempt to "achieve their highest potential" as homemakers and mothers are never a problem with me, so your statement is progressively appearing to be more and more shot full of holes. What irks you is the fact that I am holding feminists responsible for the damage that they are doing to our society. When a child is abandoned in order for a woman to have a career, and that child as a result becomes a liability to society, it was the feminist act of pursuing a career that is to blame. You can pitch a fit and cry all day long about it but you can not remove one speck of the guilt from off that woman's shoulders, or the shoulders of those who helped entice her into making that choice.

Once again I have to hear this ridiculous overpopulation charge. You call me ignorant, when it is instead your own failing. Right now the native population of America is not even reproducing itself. Our native population is actually falling. The only reason that our overall population is growing, is because of immigration. The only people who are overpopulating the planet are the third world countries, and that is mostly because Western medicine and food have made it possible. The people in the USA are not having too many children, or even close to it. Of course that is besides the point. We are producing some children and those children deserve to be raised correctly. Women who have children have a responsibility to those children. Complaining about the population explosion will not remove that responsibility.

I am not "trying to keep women at home." I am not promoting any laws that would force women to remain at home. The only ban on working women that I promote is one of sensible restrictions based upon standards of necessary ability for any given profession such as for the military, police and fire department. What I promote is freedom and it galls you. You can't stand the fact that someone actually is willing to stand up to your agenda and identify your point of view for what it is: oppression! You want the federal and local governments to promote women in the workplace, as they have been doing for the last 30 or 40 years, at the expense of the freedom of all those who disagree with you. You want feminism forced down every traditional throat of this country, and that is the definition of oppression. What you feminists want is unconstitutional, and must be opposed for the totalitarian tactic that it is.

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

I, along with our once free society, am threatened by feminism, not by women. Why does feminism threaten me? Because it is being used by the leftists in our society to increase the power of the government and to decrease the freedom of our society to function in the manner that it would naturally tend to. That is oppression, which steals our freedom. That is what I am really fighting against on this web page.

Also, on my page, I identify the absurd aspects of feminism for others to see. I show the horrendous results of accepting feminist doctrine into our society. You find that express of the truth so terribly threatening that you simply must lash out at me, making wild and incorrect accusations, in hopes of squashing the truth that I am promoting.

Thanks for helping to highlight the evils of feminism for us all to see.

-Al-

Name: Sue

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Pennsylvania

Time: 2000-04-20 19:17:00

Comments: Read your recent article, on how feminism is luring the 110+ IQ'd women away from the marriage altar, to the direction of the cucumber-hued office-suite-and how if this trend continues, our nation could become dummied-down to 3rd world servility. While the article, pushed a button-as if the mensa minority are the only ones that count-I am smart enough to realize, our best female minds should not be constrained into thinking that having a "power-b____" job is the only thing that counts. But I also believe there's more to this evolutionary flatulence-and, as with the vapors from a junkmeal, should be gone by morning (we hope). While it doesn't take a sub-particle physicist to develop a love for learning--or to pass on that love--feminism neither encourages love or learning, period! Feminism is too busy jeering and legislating away (is that constitutional?) the fairy tales, adventure stories, poetry, classics...the things the REST OF US grew up with. Feminism (male and female) is replacing this wonderful stuff with weak TV plots and those STUPID (she)wanabee-warrior(rock)videos. 'Am so sick of seeing butch-haircuts and sneaks, I could just puke--but opinions are like...everybody's got one-but only the commu/atheist ones

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

count. Yea, that's another bender--and they think the rest of us are too flamin' stupid to pick up on. I am just yet another average woman, who is beyond FED UP, and, for whatever it's worth, is doing something about it.

Sincerely,

p.s. God bless you and your wife, may you both enjoy many more years together.²⁶²

I certainly would never say that only very intelligent people matter to a society. My article merely made the valid point that given enough time of the application of the feminist philosophy, the ultimate result would be a decrease in the overall intelligence of the members of the society. The time scale for the result to be noticeable, would be large enough so that I think feminism will have long been dead of natural causes before any measurable change in overall intelligence could occur. However, if feminism were allowed to continue indefinitely, the repeated removal of the highest IQ genes from the pool would have an effect. This is not a burning issue today, but merely an interesting side effect of the feminist movement.

The television is overwhelming in its ability to herd people like sheep. The vast majority of people in our society get nearly all of their news, the bulk of their entertainment, and a large percentage of their thoughts from this device. (I have been amazed by the number of office conversations I have heard where someone has stated, word for word, something that I had heard on the television news the night before, but the speaker was speaking as if what was coming out of his mouth was his own idea.) I have not watched any regular television entertainment shows for a very long time. I grew sick of all the politically correct, leftist propaganda that saturates every one of the shows, along with the simplistic, predictable plots and jokes that are always there. It is beyond a mere waste of time. It is a program of mental manipulation to create conformity of thought. For example, you will never see a program that is blatantly anti-feminist being created today. Is that because there are no people who disagree with feminism, or who would enjoy seeing the feminist point of view being poked fun at? Hardly! The television follows a code of "ethics" which includes promotion of leftist ideas, and exclusion of all counter ideas, in its entertainment programming. (You

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

could easily produce a long list of other topics that will only be presented in the PC way on television.) When millions of people all watch the same propaganda every night, there is a shift in the way those millions of people think. Given the large number of people who subject themselves to this propaganda for several hours a day, there is little to be surprised about in seeing increased support for leftist ideas in our society.

Thanks for your kind wishes and for sharing your thoughts in my guest book!

-Al-

Name: Love

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-04-23 11:54:00

Comments: "You are trying to repress anyone who wishes to live life in a traditional manner. You want to sue companies who promote family men over single women. You want to punish companies who do not hire or promote enough women to suit you. You want to disassemble any and all male institutions in order to promote your agenda. You want to take little girls who would be happy as homemakers and brainwash them into doing something else, anything else."

Actually, i've never tried to do any of those things.²⁶³

Of course not! You just sit back and support others who do, which is the same as doing them yourself. You are so busy patting yourself on the back for being such a wonderful person that you do not take the time to think about what those of your movement are doing to obliterate the freedom once guaranteed by this great nation, or the devastation that you (your movement) have inflicted upon the lives of those who live in it.

-Al-

Name: moniker

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-05-09 05:31:00

Comments: In response to "The Hidden Factor" - Encouraging, ahem, forcing women of high-intelligence (or men) to engage in over-breeding is a complete waste of the gifts of which they have been blessed. Any INTELLIGENT society knows that quality comes before quantity. A large family, regardless of the IQs of the parents and their progeny, is no such place to nurture intelligence. A family of 12 would fall into a feed-and-clothe routine, with barely any time at all for the parents to nurture their children's minds. In a smaller, more logically-sized family, say of four children or less, the parents wouldn't have as many children to TEND to, and more time to teach and intellectually nurture their children. Having a generation of geniuses born in bloated families would not increase the standard of living. The increasings of over-large families would suffocate resources and quality of life would fall drastically. Farmers would not be able to supply enough food to feed the seething masses of humanity. Bellies would go empty.²⁶⁴

1. "Encouraging" is not "forcing," no matter how many fake coughs you use to try and cover up the word switch. A society can very well encourage intelligent women to reproduce without forcing them to do so.

2. Of course there was no mention of "over-breeding" in the article "The Hidden Factor," and so your "straw man" argument is merely noise.

3. The article did not speak to education but to intelligence. The two are completely separate. You can put a monkey in a classroom for 20 years and he will be no more intelligent than he was when he went in. The same is true of people. You can educate, but you cannot create intelligence. Intelligence, as a base starting point, is strictly a biological quantity. (Of course you can decrease intelligence through diet or damaging the brain in other ways.) You may have 12 intelligent children who never become educated, but they will have the potential to be educated, and their children will too. Therefore, the potential of the society is increased by their presence in it. Education is merely knowledge of various sorts. Intelligence is the ability to manipulate that knowledge.

4. Where did you get the number 12 from? Certainly not my article. You mentioned as an alternative, the number 4

which actually would fit nicely into what the article was saying. Right now those with high IQ's are having about 1.5 children. That is a suicidal birth rate. It will, over time extinguish any group that continues to reproduce at that rate.

5. For the sake of argument, since you brought it up, anyone who saw the movie, *Cheaper By the Dozen* will realize the spurious nature of your argument. An intelligent set of parents can do wonders with a dozen children. Also, as the older ones grow, they become contributors to the family rather than just takers. They help financially by getting jobs. They help with the younger children's homework, and in supervising the younger children. Thanks to the feminist movement, and other Leftist causes, the piggish government has driven the tax rate up so high that a large family will have to struggle to make ends meet, but I know several families who are doing just that. It can be done.

6. It is absurd to claim that the high end of the intelligent spectrum reproducing will somehow suffocate the food production capabilities more than the low end, which is reproducing in huge numbers right now. Twelve intelligent children are going to be far more able to fend for themselves without turning to crime than twelve stupid children will. That is a fact of life. IQ and crime are inversely related. Also, the intelligent children will be far more likely to make valuable contributions to society than stupid ones would once they grow up.

7. The idea that America could not afford to feed its own children, when it is allowing in millions of foreign immigrants into this country without having any trouble feeding them, is ridiculous. The United States is not in the throws of a population explosion due to its birth rate. Right now the native born Americans are not even reproducing themselves. These women are not having 4 children. On average they are not even having 2 children.

8. While you try and use your wild claims and numbers to cover up the facts, there remains the point of my article, still standing untarnished: if you inspire all the most intelligent women to not reproduce, while the less intelligent women do reproduce, that will have the net effect of removing the genes of the most intelligent women from the gene pool, and over time that will decrease the overall intelligence of the society.

Thanks for the scenic misdirection in an attempt to skirt the issue.

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

-Al-

Name: A "happy traditional" woman

Website: Never had one and never will

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-05-10 17:32:00

Comments: "Save your pity for yourself. You are the one who will have to live your life under the yoke of feminist bondage. You will have to suffer the divorce, and collapsed relationships that feminism brings to it adherents. If you have children, they will suffer from your ignorance and neglect. If you do not have children you will remove your contribution to the gene pool of the future, and therefore will have nothing to say beyond your own selfish existence. I truly pity you. " ----- I had the "very good" idea to stay at home with my children for seven years. Now I have to live with with my parents and my children because my husband became alcoholic and violent. I doubt I will get a job or an allocation from my husband soon... So don't waste your pity on this poster and keep it for me and my children.²⁶⁵

Your post has two component to it. I will deal with the last first.

It is a very sad fact of life that alcohol destroys lives. I wish this were not true but it is. Many men have had to deal with alcoholic wives and many women have had to deal with alcoholic husbands. Believe it or not, it happens to all types of families whether or not they are traditional. Nothing is perfect, including traditional marriage. If you marry an alcoholic, or anyone else with emotional problems you are going to have a sad life. With the way kids are being raised today, there are a lot more people with emotional problems today. So, I do pity you, not for being a "happy traditional" woman, but for making a poor choice in your marriage partner. It is a very difficult choice to make, and seldom do folks use their heads as much as their hearts in making it. In today's society, your situation is so common that you will find little sympathy from the general populous. You are just one more statistic to go along with all the other statistics. That should tell you something about where our society is headed.

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

The other component of your post is your trying to make it sound as if your life somehow makes feminism more logical or acceptable. It is like trying to say that since you had a car wreck, and were injured, it therefore makes sense for others to walk in front of a car on purpose. You may find this hard to believe, but there are a great many feminist mothers who live at home with their parents too. In fact feminism breeds divorce, and causes more pain and suffering like you have gone through for more people than ever before in our history. Today, over 80% of kids in the USA are not raised by their real mom and dad at home. Over 80%! When I was kid I hardly knew anyone whose parents were divorced and not living together. The few that I did know stood out like sore thumbs and everybody pitied them. There were alcoholics then too. There were divorces then too, but the numbers were extremely small when compared with today. So, don't tell me not to pity the feminist, or their children. They will almost certainly need it sooner or later.

-Al-

Name: Alie

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Planet Sane Earth, unlike you

Time: 2000-05-21 14:59:00

Comments: Wow. My god. You are stupid! I didn't think people as dumb as you existed in this world! Did your mother beat you are something? Or was it that you were rejected early on in life by a strong woman, so you associate "feminists" as "bad"? Honestly. I am 16. I go to church (Catholic) every Sunday. I live in a house with both of my biological parents, who care for me and who work hard at both their jobs and as parents. But here are some things that I just do not understand about your arguments: You say that women need to stay at home with their children. Well, why can't the men stay home with their children? And the thought that abortion is killing babies is so extremely one sided--you are obviously not a doctor or a scientist (you are too dumb) so what would you know about whether or not fetuses are actually humans? There is so much more, but I think I am going to end this by saying that you are probably an old man who is not worth the time I spent typing this.²⁶⁶

Alie,

Your post was quite entertaining. It is a clear indication of the current state of effectiveness of the feminist propaganda effort. You are right in the mold with other feminists, where you can do little more than call names. You called me dumb twice, stupid once, old once, and also suggested that I was beat and rejected as a child. You have been programmed well. No thought, just vitriol. If you can't argue, call names. You are a perfect feminist clone. The leftist attempt to destroy the influence of those who are older and wiser, who would carry on the culture, the heritage and the wisdom of previous generations, has been exceptionally effective with you as well.

Of course I am not dumb. As I have stated on several other occasions in this guest book (You might try reading a few of the entries. It would be educational for you.) I am in possession of a great deal of external evidence to the contrary, so that accusation is nothing but noise, which destroys your credibility. Just because you disagree with someone does not make him dumb, nor does it make him stupid. You make no points for your position by throwing mud, at least not in this guest book.

The fact that you are in a very small minority, being a child who lives with both of her real parents, is interesting but that is all. Since feminism hit our country, the percentage of children who are raised by both their biological parents has fallen below 20%. That means for every one like you, there are at least 5 who do not live with both of their biological parents. So, your case is an exception. I am glad for you that it is the case but it says nothing about feminism. Before feminism hit, the vast majority of kids lived with both their real parents.

Bill Clinton also goes to church. So what? Have you studied the Mafia at all? Many of their members are Catholics who go to church each week. Stating you go to church means little or nothing as far as this discussion goes. There are a great many feminists who are trying to break down the many Christian churches because they know that those churches are their mortal enemies. They are quite active in their churches! The same is true of other faiths as well, although the progression of destruction has not yet been as effective there.

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

If you had taken the time to read my page, or even this guest book, you would realize why your question about why not Mr. Mom, is silly. Men are different than woman are. If you would have read the article on my web page called THE BOTTOM LINE you would realize that the female temperament is strikingly different than the male temperament. Women can do a far better job with children than men. They have demonstrated that for thousands of years, which you would know if you had actually studied history, rather than that feminist drivel they have fed you in school. In the book *Brain Sex* which I reference in THE BOTTOM LINE there is a great deal of scientific evidence that female brains and male brains are physically different, and that is why they function differently.

In my article about abortion, the only point that I made was that two children who are equally developed, one inside the womb and one outside the womb, are equally valuable and equally worthy of the right to live. That does not take a Ph.D. in biology to understand. Even a 16 year old should be able to understand it.

But let us take it a little farther still. Here are a few facts that you may or may not know. The tenor of your post leads me to doubt that you do:

- When an abortion occurs, which is always after 6 weeks, (almost no woman even knows for sure that she is pregnant until she is at least 6 weeks along) the child has a heart that is beating, and his brain is producing measurable brainwaves. When they are deciding whether or not an adult human is still alive these are two of the most important items that they check. When an abortion is done, it stops a beating heart and destroys a working brain. It is obviously taking the life of a living being.
- The unborn baby has his own DNA from the moment of conception. All other cells in the mother's body have only her DNA, but the baby does not. It is a separate human life from the very beginning.
- A newborn infant is not human by your feminist standards. It cannot speak. It cannot walk. It cannot reason. It doesn't even look much like an adult

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

human. It cannot even roll itself over. It is completely dependant upon others for its survival.

- The only difference between a one cell zygote and an adult man is time. All humans were zygotes at one time. All human zygotes, if their existence is not somehow terminated, will become adult humans. If you kill the zygote, or the developing human at any other point along the way, the adult will be removed from existence. To kill a child of any age is to kill the adult it would have become.
- Prior to the feminist movement taking over, the AMA condemned abortion as the slaughter of human life, and abortionists as the lowest possible scoundrels. Those views were held by the vast majority of medical doctors, who as you will note, agreed with what I am saying.

Remember that any truth is extremely one sided. It is true and therefore nothing else will do.

Thanks for giving us the opportunity to see what the feminists have done to a 16 year old mind. It is sad, but it must be faced.

-Al-

Name: Amit

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-05-25 13:42:00

Comments: Dear Al, Hi! It's me again! I salute your resolve to fight on. What's the point? Are we achieving anything? I've moved from Graduate school to a major Investment bank. It's shocking to see the number of useless Women in the office. They know nothing (I mean it, One didn't even know how "Beta" is calculated and she's been with the bank for 4 years), listen to music or talk on the phone and promptly leave at 5:00 p.m.! I along with the other "Brutes" stay till at least 8:00p.m., our Boss notices the times that we "Sign Out". God Save this Country!

And our Bank is starting another new initiative "Opportunity Now" to have at least 40% women in Managerial positions! I ask only one question, how are US organizations going to make money

this way? There's a limit to the work that can be outsourced to India or China!²⁶⁷

Amit,

The point of fighting on is that when people see that there are others who agree with them, they will be less likely to stand quietly by as the Leftists continue to promote their lies to the public. When the television tells them that feminism is great, they will realize that they are not the only ones who know that is a falsehood. When they see their company promoting quota goals like your company is doing they will realize that the only point of that is to promote feminism, not women. A company does not need quotas in place to hire the best people for jobs, but only the less qualified people. If folks think about it, they will realize that quotas, by definition are going to destroy the natural order of things. If your company needed more women in their workforce to compete it would hire them automatically without goals or quotas. The superior female candidates would naturally be hired because of their wonderful qualifications rather than their sex. But it is just the opposite that is going on. Quotas force managers to hire people with inferior qualifications, simply to fill them. Since it is pressure from the government that creates these quotas, it is important that we note, this process is not fair, free or constitutional, but our government, which dishonestly claims to be controlled by our constitution, could not care less.

Your situation at work is so typical of what goes on all across the country. While there are very hard working women, very few are as dedicated as men are to their jobs. They miss more work, and work shorter hours. They take more time off for their kids, and they are more likely to quit for family reasons. This should tell us something about them being there at all, but instead we have companies bending over backwards trying to hire more of these lesser employees. Why? Big Brother demands it.

On our current path we will not have to worry much longer about how much work we can ship out to India or China, because we will be in the same economic condition as India and China. That is the wonderful New World Order that President Bush spoke about, and President Clinton, along with most other politicians today, is striving to implement. Nations

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

are passe, along with prosperity. You might as well smile now, because it is only going to get worse.

-Al-

Name: nunya

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-05-31 10:50:00

Comments: This proves my theory that stupidity is thriving among the male species. The unfortunate thing is that your wife seems to be just as stupid as you are. Perhaps it's osmosis. Or inbreeding.²⁶⁸

I suppose that you consider it "intelligent" to be rude and uncivilized in your comments.

Besides being the most wonderful woman that I have ever met, my wife is also one of the most intelligent. My wife's IQ is above that of the average doctor, and yet, in your complete ignorance you try and label her as "stupid."

And of course you try and label me as "stupid" as well. I have already dealt with that ridiculous accusation before in my guestbook (it is about all you feminists can come up with). I find that the only effective weapon that feminists (and Leftists in general) have, aside from the totalitarian actions of the government, is name calling. You call people who disagree with you "sexist," "stupid," "inbred" and/or "Neanderthal," as if passing out those ridiculous labels were somehow an argument in favor of your cause. To those who are perceptive enough to identify these tactics for what they are, it only weakens your case, which was already extremely anemic.

-Al-

Name: Amit

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-05-31 14:08:00

Comments: Nunya goes looking for Stupidity to our website ! Isn't that stupid ?

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

Al would never call your spouse any such names or insult him (or her, whichever is the case), but from frustated women like you, that is to be expected.

Next time, try to give logical arguments (even if you think men are stupid-your father is a man, by the way) not cuss words.²⁶⁹

Amit,

I think the funniest thing about the "ladies" who drop in, call names, and leave is that they show how shallow their thinking is. It shows that they believe in the propaganda that they have swallowed, and they are running in terror at the idea of it being challenged with the facts. Feminism is their religion and it must not be challenged. In fact many of them are so ignorant that they think all people subscribe to their silly beliefs and that only a crazy man would disagree with their sacred dogma. When someone stands against them they go into the "witch hunt" mode of operation. They would love to be able to use the rack and the stake to eliminate all opposition to their religion. But since that is illegal, at least for now, they are left with nothing to do but hysterically call names and throw fits.

-Al-

Name: khowyei

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfed On In

From: planet earth

Time: 2000-06-02 08:05:00

Comments: Total waste of webspace!²⁷⁰

To those who want to continue to simply, and unthinkingly, promote the feminist dogma I am sure my page would appear to be a "waste of space." Of course to anyone who likes to use their brains, and think for themselves, they will find a discussion of these issues to be interesting and useful, no matter which side of the discussion they are on.

-Al-

Name: Phoebe

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfed On In

From: France

Time: 2000-06-02 12:32:00

Comments: I believe that you've been wasting all your time spent in both building this website and thinking about feminism since you are a man and it has got nothing to do with you whether we women think that how we would like to be or what we would like to do. What we want and what we get depend on us and if you could just be in peace with the fact that we ARE in certain things better than men, you can do something more useful like helping people in the third world countries or think about how to save young generation from drug addiction rather than wasting your time. Whoops, I think I've just wasted my time as well telling all these patently true rubbish.²⁷¹

Phoebe,

It is nice you have something to believe in, no matter how misguided it may be. This page has been far from a waste of time. Over 26,000 people have visited it and that means it is of interest to a great many folks. Of course it is not the most visited web page on the Internet, or even the most visited of my web pages but it has certainly been worth the time that I have invested in it.

It is rather silly of you to suggest that feminism has nothing to do with men. Men are affected at least as much as women are by the feminist movement. As children they are no longer raised by their mothers but by strangers employed to simulate mothers. As students they are condemned for being what they are, and as adults they are discriminated against for who they are. Their children will be deprived of a mother's care as they grow up. They will almost certainly have their marriage end in divorce. They will be far more likely to see their children turn to drugs or crime because of the side effects of feminism. At work they will be forced to deal with people who are too sensitive for jokes or other normal male behavior, and they must pretend that they believe other than they really do in order to be promoted or even remain employed. All of these things are things which specifically affect men, and are therefore very much a man's concern.

What you women want may depend upon you but what you get depends upon men and their malleability to your desires, as has been the case for the entire history of mankind. Women are physically too weak to force men to do their bid-

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

ding so they must rely on their femininity to coerce men to accede to their desires. This has traditionally been through the role of husband and wife interaction. Feminism has tried to upset that apple cart by getting the government to be their “husband” and have him force their will upon others. As long as men are content to sit still for oppression, your feminist desires will be forced down all our throats. However, oppression has a way of breeding revolt, and there is this little matter of a backlash that will not be pleasant for anyone when it happens.

The third world is moving into the USA at a rate of well over a million a year, and so we will not long have to send money to other countries in order to help third world countries, we will soon be one. But that is another issue. And what do you think I am doing by fighting feminism on my web page? If our families are to survive, we must focus on keeping them together and that means to oppose feminism. If our kids continue to raise themselves then we will continue to see outrageous and illegal conduct in them. That affects everyone, men and women. In order to save kids from drugs we must eliminate feminism, and start having children supervised by their mothers again. This is something that mankind has known all along. The way you shape the young mind affects the way the teenager and even the adult will act. Turning that job over to someone else or ignoring it altogether as feminism is promoting, is a formula for disaster.

Thanks for stopping by, and it is never a waste of time to provide me with an opportunity to show how damaging, oppressive, and pure “rubbish” feminism really is.

-Al-

Name: Paul

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfed On In

From: Scotland

Time: 2000-06-03 04:39:00

Comments: Nunya is typical of the weak minded feminist foot soldier. Hate all men just for the sake of it. If men are so stupid why are their I.Q.s higher than womens on average? I myself have an I.Q. which is way above the level required for genius status. I am sure that Al's wonderful wife is not only very smart, but has a wonderful personality too, unlike the majority of feminists who seem to

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

think that they can beat the one thing that is going to destroy their own pathetic and destructive movement, common sense. People like Al and Amit are part of a growing tide of sensible people, male and female, who are seeing political correctness and feminism for what they are—full of lies, suppression and hate.²⁷²

Paul, have you ever noticed how the Leftists try very hard to belittle IQ test results? The fact is that there is no other test that can be given to as correctly predict job performance (even one that is specifically designed to test job related skills!) than an intelligence test. The Leftist controlled courts have banned the use of an IQ test as part of the job interview process, despite this fact. They claim that the tests are culturally biased or otherwise flawed, but when push comes to shove, IQ matters. Then, they love to use the word "stupid", which really means having a low IQ, as if low IQ is a reasonable concept but high IQ is not. Excuse the digression, but this is yet another area in which common sense is blatantly attacked by the Leftists.

You have put your finger right on the button. Common sense is so sadly lacking in every Leftist cause, that it is only by distracting people away from using it, that they can continue to survive. That is the root cause of why they are such great name callers, and dispensers of ridicule. There is no possibility of calm and rational thought, founded upon common sense, when the whole discussion is about emotionally charged labels and whether or not they apply. This juggling act they are attempting cannot be continued indefinitely, and when it falters, we will see the whole thing fall down around them.

Thanks for your intelligent, and insightful post!

-Al-

Name: Sam

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Arlington, Virginia

Time: 2000-06-03 11:45:00

Comments: Al, in reading the guestbook entries, I've noticed that the most obvious thing about the detractors is that they tend to resort to name calling since they really can't think of anything to refute your arguments. Maybe, for educational purposes I'll try and help

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

them out a bit.... Al, what do you make of the fact that traditional female roles, such as being a homemaker, are not valued as highly in modern times as they once were? What is the motivation today for a young woman to be her husband's helper when such work is no longer considered to have much status generally? Thanks for your response.²⁷³

Sam, as I have pointed out in my articles on the web page, feminists hate traditional women more than they hate men. The reason of course is that in order for feminism to succeed in its goal, men and women must be identical and interchangeable in all ways. The homemaker is a nurturing and caring person that is more interested in her family than moving up some corporate ladder. She is different than man, and that is not acceptable to feminists. Therefore, they have attacked the homemaker continuously, calling her names and describing her in the most demeaning fashion. From feminists we have been told that homemakers are stupid, uneducated, slaves, donkeys, and without ambition, drive or merit.

When the movies, schools and government also continually promote this completely false stereotype, it is no wonder that women are ashamed of being "only a housewife." They feel like they need to do something more to properly impress the other women who are avoiding their own responsibilities to their families. It is a little bit like a law-abiding, honest man apologizing to a con man because he doesn't rip people off.

A mother who is a homemaker works as hard or harder than anybody. She does a great work, and an important work, and our society is feeling her loss greatly today. A homemaker should hold her head up high and proudly say, "I am a wife and a mother, who is nurturing my family and raising the next generation to be strong, honest, educated, and well-mannered." It is only the most important job on earth. Feminists realizing this, understand that they must make this critical job look bad in order to justify their destructive cause in the eyes of most women.

The feminist mind shows its true nature to anyone who wants to see it, as it continually takes the wholesome, productive, critical role of homemaker and holds it up to ridicule and hate. A woman who is to proudly be a homemaker today must be a very strong minded individual, to look past the propaganda and see the real value of what she is doing. A

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

man too must be able to move past the lies and rhetoric that he has been exposed to, in order to properly appreciate the role his wife is fulfilling in making a home for their entire family. He must shoulder the difficult burden of supporting his family, so that his wife can be free to raise their children. All the while they must stand up under the constant barrage of hate and anger from the feminists and their disciples in our society, many of whom you have seen dropping off a sample of their mindless hate in this guest book. Traditional life is not for the faint of heart in the current feminist saturated environment we live in, but it is the most important thing a couple starting out today can do!

-Al-

Name: Sue

Website: Plain Page

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Pennsylvania

Time: 2000-06-03 18:29:00

Comments: Dear Al, I keep checking your site for more essays. See what you started! Sue²⁷⁴

I am sorry. :-) I am writing for a couple of other web sites, and my wife's web site and so I have not done much with this web site in a while, except for this guest book. Since you asked so nicely I will try to get another one up this month sometime.

-Al-

Name: Charles Williams

Website:

Referred by: NewsGroups

From: UK

Time: 2000-06-04 19:27:00

Comments: Never seen your site before. I hope you'll take a look at ihatefeminism.com It's a UK site, but the ideas almost mirror yours. I have one suggestion - a powerful one, I think - and this is for people to make it clear to politicians that when they moan about crime, violence, poor education, poverty etc, it is THEY, the politicians, who are responsible. That's what we pay them for. We give them BILLIONS of dollars and they fail us all the time! Many men are

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

indeed dysfunctional, violent, poorly educated etc. But whose fault is that if not those with the power? And who is getting all our money to resolve these problems? Charles²⁷⁵

Charles,

I dropped by that site and it is really quite good. I will have to get it added to my links page.

You are right about the politicians. They are responsible for what is going on in our society, but we must remember that we get what we vote for. Taking that to the next step, who is it that we vote for? And why do we vote for them? Ah, now that is an interesting line of thought. Why is it that a George Bush or an Al Gore or a Bill Clinton manages to first of all end up on the ballot, and then later actually end up in office? If you follow the process, you will note that he who gets good press, gets elected and he who gets bad press, or even worse, no press, does not. That is the reason that all candidates are so similar and why no candidate really gives a hoot about what the majority of people actually care about. The candidates are intent upon getting the stamp of approval from the press first and foremost. From there they can fight it out with another pre-approved candidate, and the people are left with two choices that are worthless.

Even when a conservative is elected, you will see that liberal programs and ideas continue just as if a liberal was elected. Under Ronald Reagan, social spending, and egalitarian based oppression went on unabated. The problems never get fixed because no candidate that is willing to fix them ever makes it into the light of day. Why? Because the press would squash them immediately if they tried to run. There are millions of people out there who agree with my view on feminism, but find one candidate for national office who would stand up and say he thought all official support for feminism should be stopped at once. Just one. Of course you can't because any such candidate would be called so many hate filled names that he could never even get started. The nightly news, every time they spoke of that candidate would connect the "honorary title" of sexist to his name. "Today the right wing sexist candidate Joe Blow spoke before an audience of jeering protestors." There may have only been one or two protestors, but the media would make them a mob. The next day

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

they would say, "The extremist candidate, Joe Blow, an avowed sexist, who is trying to gather in votes from the far right, attended a money raising breakfast in New Orleans this morning." No mention of issues, or discussion of ideas. All that the malleable voter will be exposed to are the hateful labels and obvious disgust that the media holds for that candidate. Cancel out one more candidate.

What we really need to do is to inspect who it is that actually is controlling that liberal propaganda machine in America. How is it that we have so many newspapers, radio stations, magazines, television stations and networks, and yet not one of them has a pro-traditional America stance. Not one. They all are PC all the way. Even the "Politically Incorrect" television show is hosted by an extremely left wing, PC clone. Think about it next time you watch the news, or read a paper. How is it that they are all the same, with pretty much the same political view of things? How is it that they are all merely different shades of Political Correctness? In a land of supposedly free speech you would expect to see a whole range of views being seriously expressed on television and in the newspapers. If freedom of speech were real you would find stations and major papers that had an anti-feminist editorial position. But you don't. Where are the outrageous anti-PC stations and papers? Since the media control our elections, and therefore our government, it might do us well to find out who the owners are, and why they hate traditional America so much. Just a thought.

-Al-

Name: Lauren

Website: oneiric

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: here

Time: 2000-06-04 23:54:00

Comments: Hello, Your page is very informative, and I've learned a lot of things about feminism I didn't know already. I suppose I can't really classify myself as a feminist or anything else dealing with "who's better than who". I believe that all people are created equally and that we all are here to contribute to the world what we can. Everyone has their own unique talents and abilities, and we should put them to good use so that society today can benefit from our highest

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

potentials. I've enjoyed my visit to your site, and I wish you the best of luck with it in the future. :) Take care, and God bless you.²⁷⁶

Lauren, thank you for the kind wishes. Of course no two people are created equal. That is a common myth that has been abused beyond belief. We are all created unequal, thank goodness. We are different and therefore have different abilities and talents. We have different desires and goals. Different things make us happy. That is why having the government forcing us to treat each person as if he were some machined part, coming off an assembly line, and interchangeable with all other parts, is ridiculous, counter-productive and even dangerous.

Men and women for thousands of years have put their differing talents to good use so that society could benefit. Though almost no one actually reaches their "highest potential," I would say that probably the largest number of the people who have, were mothers who were homemakers. If you read the biographies of most great men, they have become who they were to a great extent because of what their mothers taught them in their youth. I do not know of any other role, occupation or station in human existence that has been held in such high regard as that of mother. To insult a man's mother is worse than to insult the man himself, and will lead to aggressive retaliatory action quicker.

I am certainly glad you enjoyed your visit to my site. Come back anytime.

-Al- .

Name: Alicia

Website:

Referred by: From a Friend

From:

Time: 2000-06-05 08:28:00

Comments: Stupid little wimp, hiding behind a "Macho Website". B___ to you. You know the best part, I know it's a woman's world in the U.S.A, U.K, Australia, NewZealand, and western Europe. I love it. There's nothing you can do about it d___ face. Women have the support of Politicians (we are the majority of the population), U.N, the media and most of the men too! You've had your fun, it's

our time now. Honestly, I think life will be better for Men under women. We also fight in the army (it's not just men who die now), we earn equal incomes, and with us in the police, there's less police brutality. Those are the facts, I know life must be tough for men now, scared little dweebs, and the very thought delights me. PS: Read Time, even the Embryo belongs to the Mother, Good luck a_____, you'll need it, you are staring down a tunnel with no light at the end.²⁷⁷

Ah yes, a case of full blown feminism is in evidence here. Note the anger and hatred expressed openly. Note the advanced symptoms of repeated name calling. Dementia Feministia has set in and fully blocked reality to her mind as she dreams of power, where none exists. It is very sad to see when the condition goes this far.

It is a "woman's world," in this subject's mind, in countries where nearly all of the power positions are held by men, as they have been in all societies that have ever existed. If she were joking it would be a humorous idea to advance, but since she is serious, we must admit that we are observing the clear indication of the complete distortion of perception by her condition. And to fairly wallow in joy at the idea of women dying is the sign of a very strange and abnormal shift in ethical perception and loyalty quotient, for she is ecstatic at the idea of those of her own group who are being killed. The number of females who have died in battle as "soldiers" are so insignificantly small as to be hardly worthy of mention, if it were not so absurd that any women were ever placed in that position.

Note also the joy expressed at that which is completely the reverse of reality. She is delighted at men being scared, and small. Of course if men were actually frightened by feminism, they would do with feminism what they have always done with anything that they have been frightened by. How many wolves do you see in any major city? Lions, tigers, alligators, or poisonous snakes? When man finds something to be truly threatening, he wipes it out. Since feminism still exists, it is obvious that man has not yet been truly threatened by it. It is most fortunate for this particular subject, in her hallucinatory state. All sane people admit that women are on average, smaller than men. To be delighted in the smallness of

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

men is like being delighted by the brightness of night or the darkness of day. She is a very sad case indeed.

The normal female brain is very advanced in vocabulary manipulation, which allows its owner to be quite adept at choosing the correct words to express her ideas. In the case of advanced feminism, however, it nearly always causes a crippling of that portion of the brain which controls word selection, and they invariably fail to find clear expression in normal speech. Study this "lady's" post and note the repeated need to fall back upon the weakened language skills coping technique of using obscene and vulgar terminology to fill in for the unknown correct terminology, or to create unnecessary emphasis. Most pathetic.

One can only hope that she will seek help while there is still time.

Name: Irfan

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: sharjah, U.A.E

Time: 2000-06-05 08:15:00

Comments: Dear Brother Al, I feel sorry for U.S.A. I am doing my undergraduate studies here (UCLA), and can't wait to go back home. The problem is Demographics. Slowly U.S.A is turning "Grey" and the population has to be replaced by Poor countries like India Pakistan and China. Your Men have given too much to their womenfolk. If men had not invented Sanitary Napkins and Birth Control, Women would still have been at Home. Any country with a negative sex ratio (54% women) cannot remain at the helm of world power for very long. You have the technology and the arms, but the people who run the technology will not be American in the next Decade (even today it's hard to find a Non-Indian I.T Professional). Perhaps, it is history taking its toll, the power has to shift back to Asia and the Middle East. But I feel really sorry, Men here lead very harassed lives. I hope white men grow some B___ (no offence, honestly) Best of Luck.²⁷⁸

The problem certainly is Demographics, but it is not merely the graying of America. It is a problem brought about on purpose by those on the Left. They have "convinced" (through the oppressive tactics of our government) Ameri-

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

cans not have children, and to dismantle their world class school system in order to create the educational nightmare which exists today.

I, like you, hope to see American men rise up and take this country back from the Leftist egalitarians and return us to the land of my forefathers. Things look bleak at the moment, but there is always hope.

-Al-

Name: Anthony

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-06-05 12:25:00

Comments: "The secret of success in life is for a person to be ready for their opportunity when it comes." — Disraeli (http://www.ebaycareers.com/job_search/hot_index.html) I didn't know Disraeli wrote in P.C Language!²⁷⁹

No, PC language would say, "You must take every opportunity your government hands to you, but you do nothing on your own.

-Al-

Name: Gregory Whitman

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Sao Palto, Calif.

Time: 2000-06-06 12:53:00

Comments: The most discriminated group of people in the "developed" world are heterosexual White men, especially in America. And all we can do is exchange our views on the Internet like a bunch of scared boys.

My girlfriend suggests we all "take counseling to be more sensitive to women's needs" how about that Al?²⁸⁰

I was listening to an Internet "radio broadcast" the other day, where a young lady was hammering the feminists pretty good, and she said the following, "Is it me, or does anyone else equate sensitivity training with being crushed?" That is the answer for these totalitarians, force you into a brainwash-

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

ing session where you can be beaten down into conformity with the party line, at a nominal fee of course.

You should be thankful that the Internet exists. The Marxists would have already had victory wrapped up if it were not for the Internet. If you have not noticed, the media, all of it, is owned by like minded people who have the goal of promoting the Leftist agenda. You will never find a network or major newspaper that has an anti-Leftist editorial philosophy. You will not find a political party that wins, places or shows in any election that does not promote the Leftist egalitarian philosophy. Why? Because in a democracy, he who owns the media owns the government.

So, if you wonder why men have not done more in response to what is going on, you must consider what the costs are. I doubt that you can even imagine a talk show on television where a group of people all are talking about traditional families in a positive light, and the host is not attacking them with a crazed Leftist audience backing them. You will never see news anchormen saying anything against feminism. In fact you know in your own mind that there is nothing that will ever come across any of the "mainstream" media outlets that is in opposition to feminism or any other of the pet Leftist causes. You are discriminated against but that is okay because the media says it is.

The government has promoted the persecution of anyone who stands up against their oppressive agenda. Think about it. As soon as a man stands up and says anything, he runs the risk of being fired at work, ostracized as church and attacked in public. Passing out leaflets is a very low return approach, and you will find that standing on the street corner soapbox will mostly draw members of the opposition who are breaking out the tar and feathers. Until the Internet came along, the males of this nation had no voice for their views. Their government was attacking them, their pastors were attacking them, their schools were attacking them and even their wives were attacking them. There was absolutely no counter voice to what was going on. This was not by accident. It was by design, and you will see that the same people who have gotten control of our media are today working hard to control the internet. They produce "filtering" software that is supposedly to block pornography for "the children" but its real purpose is to block political sites that the Leftists do not like. They are promoting legislation to try and shut down this one outlet for

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

truth. In Canada today there is man who is on trial, not for pornography, or promoting violence, but for merely expressing his opinion on an historical event on the Internet. There are people in jail in Germany today for the same thing. If it were not for the First Amendment today in the USA you would find the same thing happening here.

Of course they package up their oppression with a glossy finish. All unacceptable ideas are labeled as "hate speech" in the media and then it is okay to outlaw it. I mean who is in support of hate? But if all you have to do to outlaw speech is to find the correct label for it, free speech has been done away with. In America today you see that there is no such thing as free speech on television, or in the newspapers. Only one point of view is promoted from them all. (The real difference between the "conservative" and the "liberal" publication is like the difference between a dime and 10 pennies. They may look and sound a little different but they add up to the same thing.)

So thank your lucky stars that the Internet exists where real freedom of speech still thrives and there is just a small chance that enough men will finally get the idea that something must be done before it is too late.

-Al-

Name: Guy Ritchie

Website:

Referred by: From a Friend

From: Leeds, England

Time: 2000-06-08 07:38:00

Comments: Thanks to you Bloody Americans! Reuters: "THE European Commission yesterday proposed a gender equality law allowing "positive action" to promote women ahead of men at work. The new code, which amends the EU's equal treatment directive, says women should have "automatic priority" in jobs where they are "under-represented", except in cases such as the Royal Marines, where male predominance is justified. The law will also make it easier for women to win sexual harassment cases in court by reversing the burden of proof. The onus will be on men to prove their innocence when accused of "unwelcome physical, verbal or non-verbal conduct". The definition of sexual harassment covers anything that affects the "dignity of women" and includes staring las-

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

civiously, making sexist comments and talking about a woman's figure." Mr. Al, I wonder what it will take before men in the USA (and therefore, in the rest of the "civilized world") stand up to this total corruption of justice and the problems they are going to bring, for everyone. Or is it that most US men have simply turned into pathetic, ingratiating little creeps who lick every feminist's boots no matter how bad they smell? I hope America Burns In HELL. All American Feminists will get Cancer of the worst kind if Jesus believes in Justice in this world. By the way, I heard another lad killed a Baby girl, Congratulations, Sport!²⁸¹

Guy ,

Killing baby girls is the one of the most disgusting things that I can think of. If you are so beaten down that you can celebrate that you are already licked. And I do not want anyone to get cancer, even the feminists. If it comes down to war to recover our freedom then so be it but let's not get wallowed down in hate. Healthy anger that moves you to appropriate action is great, destructive hatred will only bring you down. War is the place for bloodshed, and it may come to that, but until it does, we need to find positive things to do to fight these Leftist oppressors.

America is already on the road to destruction. We are displacing the people of America, dismantling our culture and institutions that created this country and replacing them will Marxist egalitarianism. Before the Leftist invasion in the 1960s (about the same time the Beatles did) America was not about equality. America was about freedom and opportunity. Enforced equality destroys both freedom and opportunity, and therefore, Marxist egalitarianism is destroying America. It may not be "buring in Hell" as you put it, but will soon be wallowing in poverty like the Soviet Union collapsed into.

The goal of the Marxist is to sow discontent, and disruption. They wish to cut people lose from their heritage and culture. Marx taught that such people are malleable and easily controlled. That is why the Leftist feminists are pushing for such ridiculous laws to be put in place. Have you noticed that the numbers of women required in the definition of proper "representation" for females in any job is the one provided by those on the extreme Left, and the laws are always based upon their point of view? Instead of focusing upon America and upon women for your hate, you need to study who it is that is

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

driving the Leftists in their cause. Who provides the media support for them, without which they would never have gotten anywhere. Who finances their movement? There is where your anger should be directed.

I have often wondered when the threshold will be crossed. As America is being dismantled, when will the pain of watching your people and your land being destroyed overwhelm the fear of losing your current state of comfort? That is the real issue. At what point will the people be willing to sacrifice their "bread and circuses" in order to regain their freedom?

-Al-

Name: Guy Ritchie

Website:

Referred by: From a Friend

From: Leeds, You Know

Time: 2000-06-09 10:09:00

Comments: You know perfectly well why I'm angry. And by the way, I was never happy on the death of the girl (it was Sarcasm), only sad for the boy who will probably be jailed now. Read this from the Observer, it says a lot about your country, Yank. "Hell hath no fury like an American feminist. If you've ever met the professional variety, you will learn that soon enough. You will discover as well that any attempt at rational dialogue with such a person is enough to prompt a torrent of abuse that is now one of the mainstays of the American left. I say this as someone who believes wholeheartedly in equality of opportunity for men and women. You name a political and civil right, and I think women should have it. But my sin is to persist in the naive belief that men and women are actually constitutively different beings, with different biological and psychological profiles that may sometimes demand different treatment. For the better part of two decades now, this belief has been anathema among American elites. Single-sex education is close to illegal. The American military has been turned into an institution in which male aggression has been usurped by female input at every turn. Under the guidance of Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, the Supreme Court has slowly rendered any different treatment for men and women in any public place unconstitutional. And under the tutelage of an academic establishment wedded to the notion that gender itself is a cul-

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

tural construct, American education and even medicine have been rendered relentlessly anti-male. At Harvard, a group of sociologists is hard at work developing new school curricula to erase any behavioural differences between boys and girls from early childhood on. The result? Well, the results are in the papers every day. Delinquent males, denied effective discipline in school and forced into female-friendly environments, are dropping out of educational establishments at higher and higher rates. The college population is now 55% women, 45% men. The American department of education reported in 1998 that the reading proficiency gap between boys and girls in school is now close to one and a half years of schooling - with girls way ahead. According to the medical profession, there is an epidemic of "attention deficit disorder" among American boys. There is a crisis of American manhood going on. The bad news is that American men seem to be getting dumber, meaner and poorer as the years go by. The good news is that some people are getting brave enough to say so. A new book, to be published next month, *The War Against Boys*, by Christina Hoff Sommers, lays out plenty of horror stories of the new educational consensus. Boys are essentially being told that what comes naturally to them - rough-and-tumble play, confrontation, physicality, mischief - are psychological disorders. In one school, boys were disciplined for making guns out of their fingers and pretending to shoot at one another. Seven-year-old boys found kissing or teasing girls are sometimes expelled on sexual harassment charges."²⁸²

I am not familiar with the case you are referring to but when you say, "Congratulations, Sport !" to someone killing a kid, it sounds like you are in support of the action. I am glad to hear that you are not.

Of course I know why you are angry, it is the same reason that I made my web page in the first place. In my essay, [Why Boys Don't Count](#) I discuss many of the things that the quote you inserted here is mentioning. When I started this page up, I was sick of listening to the wacked out feminists spewing their disgusting garbage out through the media, and through the government and the schools completely unopposed. Nowhere was there a voice that was taking a hard-line against the basic ideas of feminism. Even this guy you quoted had to make sure that he was politically correct, and lead in with the obligatory feminist obeisance with the statement, " I say this

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

as someone who believes wholeheartedly in equality of opportunity for men and women." Even when you can find someone who says something against feminism, they bend over backwards to appear feminist at heart. That is what the media has done to my country, and yours is no better my Brit friend. Why? Because the same group of people own the media in both countries and don't you doubt it for a minute.

We definitely have our work cut out for us.

-Al-

Name: B Breaker

Website: Al is a m f

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-06-12 08:20:00

Comments:

Feminist proposals routed at U.N. conference

By George Archibald

THE WASHINGTON TIMES

NEWS ANALYSIS

Conservative nations routed liberal and radical feminists at the finale of a U.N. special session on women's rights over the weekend, forcing Western powers to drop homosexual rights, sex rights for children and promotion of abortion from a new five-year U.N. agenda for women's advancement.

U_ Y____ A____! Useless piece of s____, there's nothing you can do, I almost feel sorry for you "boys".²⁸³

Oh, did we get our little feelings hurts? Boo hoo. The UN will have to be disbanded sooner or later anyway, since it is too weak to move without help from the USA, and if it ever really became a stand alone force we would have to go to war with it to retain our sovereignty. It is pretty cool to see those pack of Leftists actually backed up for a change. Bravo to the conservative nations, whomever they may be!

Thanks for dropping by, you really cheered me up. Also, your personal comment was very was funny because you left-ist girls always start with the vulgarity and the name calling when you have nothing else going for you (which is most of the time). :-)

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

-Al-

Name: Happy Christian

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Land of Jesus

Time: 2000-06-14 13:07:00

Comments: Denouncing the "moral decay" of "postmodern culture," the nation's largest Protestant denomination today voted to effectively ban women pastors and tighten control over its member churches, deeply antagonizing its more moderate and independent-minded minorities.

At its biannual convention held in Orlando, the 16,000 members of the Southern Baptist Convention voted almost unanimously to accept changes to its official creed, the Baptist Faith and Message, opposing women pastors and homosexuality and asserting the authority of the Bible.

Adding the phrase: "While both men and women are gifted for service in the church, the office of pastor is limited to men" to the creed is largely symbolic. The statement does not address women's ordination, only leading a congregation. There are about 1,000 Southern Baptist clergywomen, but only about 50 serve as pastors. Also, the official creed is not binding on individual congregations, although state conventions can put pressure on local churches.

Internally, it represents the triumph of fundamentalist conservatives who believe the Bible is "inerrant" and who won control of the convention's presidency over 20 years ago. The changes to the creed, made only twice before in the denomination's 150-year history, were made by a group of 15 chosen from among the conservative's ranks, including two women.

But as it resonates in the larger culture, the symbolism is powerful. The Southern Baptists are the largest and most prominent evangelical denomination, and count among their members many prominent politicians. To many, their creed defines the views of religious conservatives in the popular culture. In their last convention two years ago, they echoed in the secular culture by passing a resolution stating that "a wife is to submit herself graciously to the servant leadership of her husband."

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

Many more moderate churches who call themselves Southern Baptist were alienated by the latest changes on purely ideological grounds. Since the conservative takeover, hundreds of churches have drifted away from the denomination to form their own loose network, funding their own missions and seminaries and holding their own conventions.

"This just increases embarrassment for thoughtful Southern Baptists," said Robert Parham of the Baptist Center for Ethics, a new group supported by the moderate network. "By asserting women are not qualified to be pastors it padlocks the Southern Baptists into a nineteenth century castle. And it means we can no longer keep telling ourselves that the fundamentalist takeover doesn't mean anything."²⁸⁴

Well "Happy Christian" it is hard to tell whether you are bragging or complaining by this post. In my sub page, The Feminist Christian an Oxymoron I cover the topic of the so called "Feminist Christian." I also cover the biblical view on feminism in my article The Bible and the Male Chauvinist. As the Baptists, who were mentioned in the article you posted, realize, if you are thinking about being a Christian you have only two choices: 1) Accept Christianity and the Bible and reject feminism; or 2) accept feminism and reject Christianity and the Bible. Anything else is a lie.

It is rather amusing reading the Robert Parham quote. He thinks that antifeminist ideas are nineteenth century ideas and somehow connected with castles. Of course feminism is so unnatural that antifeminist ideas are as new and fresh as part of the cutting edge of the newest rational thought, and at the same time as old as man. There is nothing especially 19th century about it at all. It is merely nature at work. The ones who should be embarrassed are the ones who have been tricked into swallowing the deceitful and ridiculous feminist party line. Especially the ones who are claiming to believe in Christ, when the only thing that they know about Him comes from a book that says women should remain silent in church. That is hilarious to anyone who is paying attention at all.

-Al-

Name: Sue

Website: First NOW

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

From: Pennsylvania

Time: 2000-06-14 15:48:00

Comments: Dear Al and Guests, Yep, serious people are getting fed up with feminism--be it equity, gender, moderate,,,whatever. Have seen more and more websites, newsgroups opposing this mooovment.

There's an active newsgroup, whose purpose is to get the information (i.e. the TRUTH) about Patriarchy-- that it works, has worked and always will work.

For more info, please e-mail me. I'd love to just link it right here--they say, spread the word about the Patriarchy group, but I'm new and I just don't quite feel comfortable with putting the link out on a busy guestbook. Though a good 95% percent of your guests are SERIOUS. The fembot 5%, has me a bit nervous. Thank you, God bless²⁸⁵

My e-mail is: SBotchie@aol.com

Sue,

Thanks for dropping by again! I visited your page and it is looking really good. Keep up the good work.

-Al-

Name: Creep, Rapist, What's the difference?

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfed On In

From: Cleveland, OHIO.

Time: 2000-06-19 09:49:00

Comments: Dear Al,

Read the following article. And please note this "Dignified" Woman's place in Society, if her male counterpart had given such advice to a Man, he would have been arrested.

Judge advises marrying a doctor.

Female defendant lectured about men.

CLEVELAND,

A Cayhoga County judge advised a female defendant that she needed a better man in her life, and trying the library of the local medical school was one way to find him. Common Pleas judge Shirley Strickland Saffold --herself married to a doctor --told 19 year old Katie Nemeth at a sentencing this week that she should look for

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

Dr. Right and went on in earthy language to lay out the facts of life as she saw them.

Nemeth had pleaded guilty Monday to misuse of a credit card, a misdemeanor.

Terry Gilbert, Nemeth's lawyer, said yesterday that Nemeth had worked in a store where a customer had lost a credit card. He said Nemeth's boyfriend ended up with the card and made some purchases, but he later repaid the owner.

Nemeth pleaded guilty to a minor charge to resolve the case, and paid a \$200.00 fine.

But Saffold went beyond the fine, lecturing Nemeth on how to straighten out her life, according to a transcript of the hearing.

Saffold told Nemeth that every woman in prison she had interviewed told her she was there because of a man.

"Life is about choices," Saffold said from the bench. "You can be with him (her current boyfriend) or you can go sit over in the medical school and act like your studying and meet one of those doctors. You see what I mean?"

The judge advised Nemeth to take a textbook and pretend to read it. "When one of them (medical students) walks by, say excuse me, could you tell me what this means?" the judge said. "You get yourself a date."

"Men are easy," Saffold warned. "You can go sit at the bus stop, put on a short skirt, cross your legs and pick up 25. Ten of them will give you their money. It's the truth."

Saffold went on to tell Nemeth "If you don't pick up the first ten, then all you got to do is open your legs a little bit and cross them at the bottom and then they'll stop."

The judge again urged Nemeth to go to CWRU and pick up a doctor. "Marry a doctor lickety split," she said before imposing the fine.

Gilbert would not comment on the judges remarks and his client could not be reached.

Saffold protested last night that her remarks were taken out of context.²⁸⁶

It appears that Judge Saffold gave all her trade secrets away. I wonder if she did something similar to this to land her "judgeship." This really highlights where the feminists are at. I really liked the part about the short skirt and then telling her that once she is in her

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

short skirt, "open your legs a little bit and cross them at the bottom." And she even told her that the men would give her money. Is this a judge or a pimp speaking? This is too funny. Here's a judge, who has supposedly reach the feminist dream of being a "professional," telling this girl to go land a rich husband, just like mothers have told their daughters for generations. Hypocrisy is almost as common with feminists as is lying, which is not far behind breathing as a common trait.

Thanks for sharing this with us. It is great!

-Al-

Name: Amit

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-06-20 14:55:00

Comments: Hey Al, You don't have any new articles. Busy elsewhere? I have something to tell you, My boss (a 55 yr. old Man , very senior) is actually dominated by his 32 yr. old secretary, she actually shouts at him! My god, he's shit scared of her. He almost had to plead to her to send a fax (it was 4:55, time to go home you know). I sort of hinted to him , and he abruptly changed the topic, I got the message. It's 8:00, and guess who's still in the office, Moi, Anthony and Michael. The women have fled (not that they were any good while they were in the office). It's been 3 months and only one good, intelligent woman (Anna, handles Convertible Bonds and Warrants). All the guys really like her, she's usually with us at lunch time (even though she's really senior) and hates Ally Mc Beal! Nice Lady. However, every single woman on this floor (and I swear I'm not exaggerating hates her, infact they don't even greet her in the morning). Life really sucks, the woman who sits opposite my desk keeps bothering me all day, she's a duffer, really, and she loves to read "People" magazine (and other similar pearls of Wisdom), not only does she not work, she also reads out the articles to me, tell me, how do I shut her up without getting sued.²⁸⁷

Welcome to the wonderful world of feminism, where equal opportunity means that women can work fewer hours and accomplish less, but still complain that they are not making as much money. If you call them on it, you are a sexist pig!

-Al-

Name: Shelly

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-07-05 13:28:00

Comments: I don't agree with anything on your website at all. Women are humans too, and we deserve to be TREATED like humans! We are not slaves, and we are certainly not sex toys! We are rational human beings who are just as intelligent as men! We can think for ourselves, and we can take care of ourselves! We don't need a man to take care of us!²⁸⁸

Shelly,

You must mean some other web site. I think women are humans too. I think that they deserve to not only be treated as humans, but as the very special creatures that they are. Women are not slaves, and while they certainly are sexual beings they are much more than that. Women are sometimes rational and sometimes not, and in some areas they are as intelligent as men, while in other areas they are not.

A point of disagreement is that women do need men to take care of them. A woman who is not protected by men in one way or another will be living in constant danger. The men of the police and the military give her protection today and so feminists like you think that is enough. Many women are finding that is not the case. As our society continues to deteriorate, more and more women will realize that men who are their protectors are to be valued greatly when compared with the male predators who will make up the bulk of any society where feminism rules. When men start viewing women as being able to take care of themselves, men no longer give women the special consideration that is needed for women to get along in a society where men are present. In the long run, a woman will be either a special creature, treasured and respected, or a sexual object to be used. Men have a natural biological urge to gravitate towards the latter, but civilization teaches them to accept the former. Feminism is destroying that civilizing instruction and creating men who no longer wish to be good husbands and protectors for their women. You and other feminists will one day realize that you have been used as pawns in the power struggle going on in America and many other nations of the world. These power brokers don't care about women and they never have. They use women as disposable tokens, and once used for their purpose, they cast them on the heap of what they

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

consider unimportant females, who have broken homes, undisciplined children, and a husband who left years ago.

-Al-

Name: Mark

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfed On In

From: Surrey

Time: 2000-07-12 07:23:00

Comments:

The Spectator Melanie Phillips, senior journalist in The Sunday Times, exposes the great conspiracy against men; the victims of a sexism that is not only legal in Britain today, but mandatory. And here she is ..

"ONE of the many mysteries of our age is why the British establishment has declared open season upon half the human race.

Men are being systematically robbed of their reputation, their children and their purpose in life. The people responsible for this sexual warfare are sober women and men in suits-pin-striped, rather than boiler-not to mention wigs and gowns.

If what is routinely thrown at men was directed at any of our fabled victim groups -women, black people, gays-society would stand condemned of the most vile prejudice, discrimination and even persecution. Yet the vast majority of people either don't know how the dice are being loaded against men or, if they do have an inkling, think deep down (or not so deep) that, well, they really do deserve it.

You think this is exaggerated?

Consider the review of sexual offences which is about to be published. Through judicious leaks, the government has indicated that it wants to toughen up the rape law because not enough men are being convicted. So it intends to skew court proceedings against them to make them less able to defend themselves against a prosecution.

Just think about that for a moment. Suppose the government said, for example, that not enough women were being convicted of shoplifting so it was going to make it more difficult for them to mount a defence. Unthinkable, isn't it? That's because the implication that women were naturally shoplifters would be preposterous, that artificially inflating the number of convictions for shoplifting to fit this false stereotype would be grotesque, and that it could only be

done by junking our most precious legal maxim that a person is innocent until proved guilty.

Yet this is precisely what is being proposed in rape cases.

The government intends to change the definition of consent to sex, the common defence against the charge of rape, so the defendant will have to prove that the woman did in fact consent.

Lawyers are divided over whether this would technically mean reversing the burden of proof. All agree, however, that it would make it much more difficult for a man accused of rape to defend himself. And that's because the government assumes that all men accused of rape are guilty.

In fact, the evidence suggests this is completely untrue. Home Office figures for 1996 showed that 25 per cent of rapes reported to the police were false or malicious or the complainant withdrew the charge. In a further 39 per cent of reported cases the police or the Crown Prosecution Service took no further action because the complainant and suspect knew each other and so the circumstances were ambiguous; and a further 7 per cent of cases resulted in an acquittal.

Yet the government not only fails to acknowledge this, but also uses statistical jiggery-pokery to produce a false picture of soaring rapes and thousands of rapists escaping conviction.

True, there was a fall in the conviction rate from 24 per cent in 1985 to 9 per cent in 1997. Yet that may be because freer sexual behaviour makes rape claims more untenable. While 'stranger rapes' are very rare, 'date rapes' between acquaintances have soared from 1,300 in 1985 to 5,000 in 1996, almost half of all reported cases.

Rape is without doubt a most heinous crime. Yet most reasonable people would probably think that being jumped on in a dark alley is a completely different matter from having second thoughts, sometimes in retrospect, about a bloke with whom you've gone home after a party or with whom you've already been sleeping.

Anti-man prejudice, in fact, runs through government thinking. Baroness Jay and her Women's Unit constantly fork out the old chestnut that one woman in four is assaulted by her partner. In fact, most British domestic violence studies on which the government relies for such claims are effectively rigged; they ask only women, not men, for their domestic violence experiences, mainly from self-selecting samples of abused women.

Yet reputable international research shows overwhelmingly that acts of domestic violence are initiated by women upon men at least as frequently as vice versa.

Asked why the Women's Unit had made no reference to all this research, Jay replied that the government couldn't get involved in such 'subtle' issues.

Instead, it resorts to unsubtle threats to pursue feckless 'deadbeat dads' for child support, promoting the impression that fathers routinely desert their children.

In fact, many fathers desperately want to continue to parent their children after divorce but find that the courts put huge obstacles in their way, even if the men have acted blamelessly while their wives have not.

Family court judges tend to force fathers to prove they are fit parents, prove they are not violent or feckless. By contrast, they assume that mothers are generally the best parent for the child to live with, regardless of how they have behaved.

Of course, some men do behave very badly towards their wives and children. Divorce barristers, however, estimate that no more than about a third of the husbands they see are violent, and that both women and men cheat on each other in equal proportions.

Yet the courts are institutionally biased against husbands, ousting them from their homes on the slightest pretext, stripping a man of his children and his assets even if his wife has gone off with a lover and his own behaviour has been exemplary.

The judges will also accept a wife's claims that the man is violent on the basis of no evidence, in a system where it is impossible to mount a proper cross examination of her allegations. Yet on this pretext they will deprive a man of contact with his children.

Lack of contact with their children is a source of immense injustice and misery for many fathers. Lawyers say a typical scenario is this.

Mother decides to divorce because she's got a new man. The easiest way to get rid of Father is to claim he's been violent to her or the children. The father leaves or is ousted. His access to the children is governed by a contact order made by the court on the advice of a court welfare officer. Yet the mother has the whip hand in controlling the father's contact. He finds regularly that the children are too busy to see him. When he turns up to see his children, it's often

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

the boyfriend who tells him to push off. Yet somehow the mother seems able to persuade the court that she is entitled to move the contact goal posts without redress.

The new president of the High Court's family division, Dame Elizabeth Butler-Sloss, denied earlier this year that fathers got an unfair deal on contact although, she added ambiguously, a small minority of non-custodial fathers 'gave rise to real problems'.

How could she possibly be so complacent when fathers are routinely denied contact on grounds produced by welfare officers that are so spurious as to be incomprehensible?

There was the father who, in McDonald's, spread his arms to his daughter and said, 'Bet you haven't seen me in a suit before', a watching welfare officer misinterpreted the gesture, decided the child had refused to return the father's proffered embrace, and he was denied all contact with the child as a result.

Then there was the father whose overnight contact with his five-year-old was stopped because 'the child had many milestones ahead of him'; another who was denied contact because he 'had to prove his commitment'; another because 'this is the mother's first child'; another because he was 'over-enthusiastic'; yet another because 'the child fell asleep in his car on the way home'.

One child of 13 hadn't seen his father for eight years because he was led to believe that an injunction against his father prevented it. No one—certainly not his mother—had told him that the injunction would last a maximum of three months and that for most of that eight years he had every right to see his father. And so on and so, appallingly, on.

The disastrous impact of fatherlessness upon children is well-documented. The impact on fathers is less well-known. Some are driven to nervous breakdowns or suicide; others lose their jobs as they try to visit their children who have moved to a different part of the country.

Of course, there are men who walk out on their wives and bust their families. But the majority of men are divorced against their will. The pain of family breakdown becomes unbearable when compounded by the gross injustice of a legal system that under cover of impartiality so often rewards the offending spouse and punishes her victim.

How can this happen?

Welfare officers' conclusions about divorcing spouses are rarely questioned by judges who regard these officers as the only source of expert advice in such cases. Until now, they have been probation officers; henceforth, they will also be drawn from the children's branch of the Official Solicitor's Department and from guardians ad Stem. Yet this reform is unlikely to do much to counter their prevailing ethos, encapsulated by a document produced by the National Association of Probation Officers in 1996.

Entitled 'Equal Rights: Anti-Sexism Policy', this proclaimed that marriage subjected women to male tyranny; that society was based on patriarchal male control over women and children which extended into all institutions that the oppression of women must be challenged in the courts; and that therefore the aim of the welfare officer was to 'challenge the discrimination against women in contested residence and contact decisions'. Such sentiments may seem extreme; but the presumption of male violence which underpins them is now common throughout the family law system.

The Lord Chancellor's Advisory Board on Family Law said last year that the courts should stop fathers seeing their children simply on the basis of allegations of violence by their ex-wives. The board's extraordinary presumption of male guilt was backed by its claim that domestic violence research indicated 'in the great majority of cases the abuser is male and the victim female', and that fathers were overwhelmingly the perpetrators of domestic violence.

Yet the research certainly does not show this.

Most violence against children, moreover, is perpetrated by mothers or boyfriends.

A child's natural father is least likely to be violent towards it. The courts should actually be giving fathers, not mothers, the benefit of the doubt.

Many judges think mothers are intrinsically vulnerable and must be protected as they are generally to be the parent with care of the children. Yet why should this be? If a mother has gone off with her lover, jeopardizing the well-being of her children and demonstrating infidelity to their father, promise-breaking deceit and selfishness, why should she be automatically regarded as the fitter parent to bring up the children?

The answer is to restore issues of conduct to divorce and the subsequent care of the children. The spurious argument that 'children's

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

needs' must come before any other consideration means children are being used as hostages to protect adults from facing the consequences of their own behavior.

Children's needs are best met by having both their parents to look after them; failing that, by living with the more responsible parent.

This may even bring the divorce rate down, as has happened in America in states where mothers no longer get automatic custody.

Men are terrified of being thought prejudiced against women [not on this web site] not least because of an old-fashioned sense of chivalry. They look at the absence of women among captains of industry or Members of Parliament; they look at the football hooligan and the burglar from hell and they think it must be true that men are basically vile victimizers and that women are their victims.

But life's a lot more complicated; and the result of such brow-beating into false stereotypes is that everyone ultimately becomes a loser."²⁸⁹

The attack upon the men of our society is specifically intended to remove the power that they once had to oppose oppression. Today the average guy on the street feels helpless in the face of the Leftist takeover of his society. He fears the loss of his job or even his freedom if he opposes the destructive changes which have been forced upon us. This story you posted shows yet another assault upon the very ones who should be the defenders of society, who would be willing to give their lives in defense of the ones who are attacking them. What is wrong with this picture?

-Al-

Name: Sam

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-07-12 10:34:00

Comments: Al,

Regarding your article "The Myth of the Two Income Family," I'd like to comment that the points you make are in agreement with observations in a popular book (a good one) I've read recently--"The Millionaire Next Door: The Surprising Secrets of America's Wealthy" by Thomas J. Stanley, Ph. D. and William D. Danko, Ph. D. The authors describe the typical American millionaire as a 57-

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

year-old male, who is married with 3 children, and who earns the great bulk of his household's income. Furthermore, about 50% of the wives of millionaires DO NOT WORK OUTSIDE THE HOME. The #1 occupation of those wives who do work is teacher. The point of all of this is that you don't need a two-income family to even get wealthy, let alone live comfortably. The reason that so many families think they need to have two incomes is because of decades of media-driven propaganda which tells people to burn their income rather than value and save it.

In short, Al's article is right on the money.²⁹⁰

Thank you Sam!

Name: Sue

Website: First NOW

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Pennsylvania

Time: 2000-07-21 08:34:00

Comments:

Dear Al,

Rape -- the low-life act of grabbing a woman (on her way to or from the store, library, cousin's house) and dragging her into an alley, or breaking into her apartment. But this word (rape) is just one, among others, stolen; its meaning, stretched and WARPED by a certain faction--educated well beyond their intelligence.

This abrasive deed has become watered-down, as just another excuse to put (and keep) men on the wrong side of the "law"(?)--steal his money, his future (job potential) deny him his constitutional right to keep a firearm (to defend himself and his family from real scumbags--half of whom are sucking up our tax-dollars to enact these namby-pamby ordinances (drawn up by their master, who dwells below).

Meanwhile, people have the gall to wonder why young men lack ambition. Well, gee wiz! When an individual's sex is devalued, how's he (inclusively speaking) expected to value himself, his time, his abilities. His very nature dissed, again and again, all over the media--that's hardly an incentive for a young man to cease wasting his paycheck on excuse-juice (at \$3.75 a shot).

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

Al,,, those females over there are fleecers. Hope the young men, who stop at that bar, take care. They don't need charges filed from little chippies, who give it away--(sooooooooo often) then get cranked after guys take their fill, and head on down the road, to take more of the soooooo cheap and available, same old, same old....

Can't help but to think, the source of these STUPID "rape" laws originate in the jaded minds of harpies-long in the fang and darn mad, because they've trouble copping a one-nighter (let alone a relationship). I know this sounds mean, but that's the way it is. These college-educated "wimmin", should've had the common sense, the foresight to realize that time is linear-that women get old, and men in their 40's and 50's aren't interested in gray-rooted butch-cuts or rayon stretched loudly over sagging midriffs.

Oooppss, forgot-again! Preparedness only counts for career and post-career financial choi(iiii)ces.²⁹¹

Sue

Dear Sue,

You raised some excellent points. I once saw a feminist on television more than a decade ago, who was promoting her then new book. The name of the book was "Intercourse" and there may have been a subtitle as well. Anyway, I can still recall the jacket cover of that book where the word Intercourse was drawn in such a way as to represent that it was a phallus performing a sexual act into a mass of bright colors. The author revealed that her book was about the "fact" that the very act of intercourse is the invasion and humiliation of the woman's body. The author was dressed in a pair of coverall, and other items that would have removed any ideas that a man would ever have of "humiliating" her physical person. She, along with many other feminists believe that a wife is being raped every time her husband makes love to her.

And, while complaining incessantly about rape, they have removed the real bite that the crime has in the mind of the average citizen. When a woman's virtue was something to be honored and treasured, rape was considered a "fate worse than death." And the punishment for it was the same as for first degree murder. Today, with the feminist view of rape, it is a much lesser offense. That is what feminists have done for women on that issue!

While men are now easily threatened with prosecution for rape, or are actually convicted of rape, for having consensual sexual relations with a willing but untrustworthy woman, those who commit

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

real rape and even rape with murder, are back out on the street again to did it again, if they are ever convicted of it at all.

Feminism has said that women are the same as men and that they should be treated exactly the same. And then every one of their actions have been designed to ensure that will never happen. They said that women can do the same job at work as men, but then feminists agitated for laws and court rulings to change the workplace so that women can tolerate it. "Equality" of treatment, meant that all of these new regulations had to be put in place. Suddenly, day care was said to be part of "equal" treatment, which men never asked for before. Suddenly men had to look over their shoulders when they were talking at work, and they had to be careful what they read at work, because these "equal" members of the workplace were not capable of dealing with the masculine environment they were entering. Women were not told to toughen up and take it like men do, (which would have been equal treatment) but instead, "equal" treatment forced the men to act like women. I digress but it needed saying.

Thanks for sharing your thoughts!

-Al-

Name: Independent Woman

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-07-25 10:51:00

Comments: Your definition of chivalry sounds like slavery. My ancestors were under that yoke before and consistently lied to that it was appropriate and a "right" to which their masters were entitled. ... I have no interest in being under any form of it today.²⁹²

Nice try, but that analogy just won't wash. How many "Husband" magazines are out there on the magazine shelves? Now check out the "Bride" magazines. Notice the difference? Women dream of marrying a good man and having a family. They fantasize about it, with their magazines, and their romantic novels. How many people who later became slaves do you know who fantasized about it, or free men who dreamed of how wonderful it would be to be a slave?

Chivalry, is a code of ethics by which a man gives up to the weaker sex, many of the things he could easily demand or take, because of his natural physical dominance (granted by biology), as a form of civilized and gracious behavior. If Chivalry were truly slavery there never would have been a woman's movement because it

would have been easily crushed by the male "masters." Women would never have a prayer of physically challenging men if men seriously opposed them.

The traditional roles of men and women came from biology. The natural tendencies of both of the sexes are best served by those roles.

On the other side of the coin, men and women both have selfish tendencies which are curbed by focusing upon creating a strong family. Men naturally tend towards promiscuity, and violence. The family reigns them in and redirects their competitive and aggressive natures towards constructive and productive endeavors in the work place in order to support their families. Instead of being a drain on society, married men are instrumental in shaping the framework of our society. Women naturally tend to focus upon clothes and beauty items, and shopping for trinkets. A single woman is usually frittering her life away. But put her in a family, and her talents are put to excellent use. She runs the home and guides the children. If she has a good husband who properly supports her, and their children, she will be a major force in shaping the next generation.

Sure, taking your responsibility seriously is a big crimp on your free time. For 99.9% of the people, showing up for work is not something they want to do, it is something they have to do, if they want to eat. We are all slaves to our stomachs. We must eat or we die. If we want to live in a crime free society, we must teach our children to be law abiding, and it has repeatedly been demonstrated that this is best done by a mother at home, backed up by a father who lives in the same house as his biological offspring.

Biology is what demands this, and so if we are slaves, it is to our very nature. Whining about it is really rather useless. Instead, what smart people will do, is to make lemonade rather than crying about all the lemons they have been handed. Women are not men, and men are not women. Women logically will take on the responsibilities that they are best suited for, and men will take on those that they are best suited for. If the Federal Government had stayed out of the way and let things go on naturally, you would have seen how incapable women are of actually competing with men in most occupations. (And therefore would have stopped trying. Just like they stopped trying to qualify for men's professional sports.) Feminism is a sham held up by oppression by the state.

For example, if we had not lowered the physical standards in the occupations that very much need them (i.e. policeman, fireman, soldier, etc.) we would have nearly zero women in those professions. Lowering standards does not improve the quality of the employee who has to meet them. Therefore, it is not that women have

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

suddenly became capable of being policemen or soldiers, but it is that policemen and soldiers have become less useful and capable of performing their jobs. Those who promote women into jobs through government coercion are not interested in protecting our society from criminals, or protecting our country from aggression. They are only interested in their own selfish agenda and nothing else. Instead of being happy with whom they are, they look at men with jealousy, and hate the fact that they themselves are women

There is nothing more disgusting about the feminist movement to me than the absurd, and condescending arrogance that feminists ooze from every pore as they insist that the American citizens do not have the right to hire whomever they choose, for whatever reason they choose, and that the Federal Government is obligated to force the feminist agenda down America's collective throat. They have no reason, or biological support for their contention that the sexes are exactly the same except for the plumbing. There is a tremendous amount of scientific evidence to show that they are wrong. But they still expect everyone to play the fool for their sham.

Well, sorry but those days are over. There are more and more folks who are finally standing up and admitting that the Emperor has no clothes. And it is about time too!

-Al-

Name: Dosen't Matter

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From:

Time: 2000-08-03 13:13:00

Comments: Where are these folks you keep talking about? And what are they doing about it? The fact is that Men now enjoy the same Status that Jews did in National Socialist Germany. You sound extremely optimistic, but almost everyday, the newspapers beg to differ as a new Anti-Male law is passed. I personally feel all women (especially of the low income variety) should be given the death sentence when they choose to be single mothers. They are breeding the next generation of criminals. They grow up to be Teenaged men who are most certainly going to end up in Jail, and then men will get blamed even further. Ever watched those "talk shows" where 6-7 men and a woman show up to find out who's the father? Even when all men are acquitted (yes, it is like an acquittal) the sympathy is given to the tart and the men are jeered and booed. Recently, the prose-

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

cution finds out after 10 years that a man in texas who is serving a 99 year prison Sentence (99 years, it's an absurd sentence, the death penalty is much more dignified!)actually never committed rape and was falsely accused. The injustice and institutionalized Hatred against Men has shaken my belief in God. And you still think, "Folks are waking up". No Al, they are dead and Buried and Feminazis spit on their graves.And the laws are going to change to trap even single men who choose never to get married.²⁹³

Some folks are waking up, and I can testify to that from the email I receive. You would think with a web page like I have, I would be buried with hate mail. But most of my mail is supportive. There are a lot of folks who are sick and tired of the oppressive government, and that my unhappy friend is where revolutions are born. You won't find these people in the Democratic party, or even the Republican party. (Both of these organizations are anti-male and anti-traditional America.) The conservatives are working hard to "conserve" the destructive changes brought upon us by the Left in the 1960s. The ones who are waking up are working outside of those corrupt systems.

You may be right in your pessimism. America may be dead, and finished. If things do not change, America will be a third world country in just a few more decades. But I have more respect than that for the American people who built this country, and I have hope that they will once again ignite the passionate hatred of tyranny that created this great country in the first place. I hope to see them throw down the tyrants and reestablish the Manifest Destiny that drove Americans to raise a great nation upon this land. The race is on and we will see whether the Leftist enemies of America can destroy her completely before the people arise to protect themselves. Join with me in attempting to inspire the people to do what needs to be done! What do you have to lose, besides a yoke around your neck?

-Al-

Name: Pontiff Maximus

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

From: Houston Texas

Time: 2000-08-03 18:16:00

Comments: All women are morons. Except your mom!!! When a woman can kick my ass I might consider her an equal. When a woman can be flexible in business and figure out policy books are

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

written on paper and not engraved in stoned I might consider her an equal. When women stop asking how do I look when she goes out to the garden to pick her stupid useless flowers that are going to die in a day or two I might consider her an equal. When a woman stops being emotional I might consider her an equal. When a woman comes home from shopping and says "Honey I saved you 100% I did NOT buy anything I might consider her an equal. This could go on for ever but I won't use up all the space like the previous feminist posts in here that actually say and mean nothing in fact. It is a fact that women are emotionally and physically inferior to the male. They can operate machines invented and manufactured by males like the typewriter but ask one to repair one. How many women even wrote software. And I don't mean stole an idea from someone then had a programmer write it for them to get the women minority load just to go shopping with the money.²⁹⁴

The feminists are working hard to produce this attitude in men. They continually beat the drum of equality, as if it were a fact. They force men and women to pretend like women can do anything a man can do. Then with these ridiculous ground rules in place, we are then all forced to deal with the real world, where biology and reality do not care what feminists say, or what the Supreme Court rules.

Women are not morons, they are just different than men, with different talents than men have. Their brains are physically different than men's brains. In business they are at an extreme disadvantage, and I recently saw a feminist on television say that she felt that women would never fill half of the real leadership positions in business because they were not driven towards that role.

I don't get the flower thing either, but I don't care. The smile that a flower puts on my wife's face makes it worthwhile for no other reason. Watching the joy it brings to women warms my heart, just like my wife is warmed by the joy I get from my love of electronics and science, which she has no love for at all. I am so happy that my wife cares for our home, because I live in a tidy, warm and homey place that I could never have created on my own. Together, men and women build things greater than either could build separately. At least they do when feminism gets out of the way and lets them.

Women are nurturing. I remember when I was teaching electronics in the Navy, one of the very few female sailors we had coming through the class, set to cleaning up the instructors' desks and doing general housekeeping duties that she was never assigned. No male sailor ever had the thought cross his mind to do such a thing. But it

was a nice thing to do, and women often are like that. That is why they are so great with kids. They tolerate behavior that Dad would punish for, and they care about the little things a child brings to them to share, in a way that only a mother can. Men are inferior to women in this area.

In the areas that you mentioned, women on average are inferior to men, and they always have been. They always will be. But why is that even a concern? Because feminism made it a concern. Feminism is striving to drive a square peg into a round hole, and they are using the government as a hammer to do it with. All of the crazy and destructive side effects from this process are the chips flying from the once healthy society we once had. If the peg and hole are the same shape the fit is smooth and creates few problems. When they differ, the problems are many. So, it was before feminism, where the roles of men and women fit their own capabilities. The divorce rate was very low, and most kids were raised by both of their real parents. Ladies and gentlemen grew old with their families intact. As they grew old, their children and grandchildren were around them and honored them. Today the reverse is true. And families are coming apart as fast they the come together.

Anyone who remembers his childhood, and what his mother meant to him, would never call her a "moron." She was different than Dad, and if you are honest about it, you were happy for the difference. Women have their own kind of genius, and all civilizations have benefited from it. They do not make the best rulers, or the best businessmen, but they make homes the best that they can be. They raise the next generation to be strong and healthy, rather than warped and twisted. For certain areas of life we stand on the shoulders of all the men who have come before us and did their part to make it a better world for their children. But in other areas of our society we are just as indebted to the soft and caring shoulders of the women who came before us.

The point is that women are different from men and should be treated differently than men are. They should have different roles in society and they should be honored for the things they do better than we do, instead of having them forced into doing that which they are inferior at. The real villains in this play, are the feminists who are driving this process along.

-Al-

Name: Independent Woman

Website:

Referred by: Just Surf'd On In

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

From:

Time: 2000-08-07 09:47:00

Comments: I have a question, Al. Let's suppose American turns completely to your way of thinking. There would still be women that want to have jobs and/or careers. There would still be lesbians who would not embrace heterosexuality. There would still be women who have no interest in being married and/or having children. There would still be divorcees and widows. There would still be single moms, whether by choice or by accident or by rape. There would still be wives and girlfriends who are victims of domestic abuse. There would still be wives married to worthless husbands who have no intention of respecting them or their children. What would happen to these women?²⁹⁵

This question has an easy answer: Just look that the way things were before, when America was already turned to "my way of thinking." It is my familiarity with the America of the 1950s that makes me so completely certain of what I am saying.

In the 1950s, we had a crime rate that was well below the crime rate of today. There were no school shootings, and the divorce rate was very low compared with today. The average child grew up in a household where both of his real, biological parents, resided. Illegal drugs were nearly unheard of for children. Even legal drugs (alcohol and tobacco) were far less abused by children. Women and children were safe on the street after dark, and the American schools were the best in the world. I am sure that even you can see the difference between that wonderful situation, when compared with the mess we are in today.

1. There were female homosexuals then just like now. Homosexuality was frowned on by the society and therefore those who decided that they just had to practice it, did it covertly. Since that affects less than 4% of the population it is clear to any clear thinking individual that the whole homosexual subject is merely a side issue that should not concern the mainstream of our population. Take for example, Raymond Burr, the actor that played Perry Mason in the television show of the 1950s. He was a homosexual but kept it to himself and nobody was put out about it. He did not lose his job and he was not abused, he just kept his lifestyle to himself.
2. As for women who did not have an interest in being married, they existed too. However, their numbers were much smaller

then because our society was much saner, and promoted the natural roles for men and women. Girls were taught in school that they were going to become homemakers and they looked forward to being like their mothers, who were for the most part good housewives. When girls are not brainwashed with the lesbian propaganda, and boys are taught to accept their natural role in life, most of the boys and girls grow up to become men and women who will form long lasting marriages, with the men providing "the bacon" and the women caring for the home and children.

Once again, we are talking about a very small and insignificant percentage of the female population that will be dead set against marriage. For those, like in the 1950s they can go out and get work. There were "old maid" women who were college professors, and scientists and many other things. Their numbers were small and for the most part, they were of no real import as far as the society was concerned but that option was always there.

3. Single moms existed in the 1950s too. They had homes set up for unwed mothers. It was considered to be something for which a girl should be very embarrassed over and I think that was a very good thing! You should be embarrassed for creating a bastard child, that you will not be able to support, and that you will no doubt have to take charity for to raise. You should be embarrassed for creating a child that will be raised without a father, which is a cruel deprivation. You should be embarrassed for having sex with someone you are not married to, and have no intention of marrying. When society promoted a wholesome attitude about sex, expecting kids to wait until marriage before having sex, the result was that far more kids did wait until marriage before having sex. And of the ones who didn't, most of them got married to their partner, either before or after a pregnancy made them face the consequences of their actions. The "uptight" attitudes of the 1950s is what created the atmosphere that made marriage a lot more certain of working than the loose and stupid attitudes of today.

As for the women who were single mom, life was hard, like it is today. That is why the lifestyle should be avoided by making wise choices.

4. The 1950s also had divorcees and widows. Widows were usually cared for by their church and their families. Most people feel great sympathy for a widow. If she is young

enough she would normally remarry. That happened to a couple of my Mom's sisters in the 1950s. Others had to tighten their belts and find a job. Their children suffered greatly if that happened and just like today, if the children were left alone, they often turned to crime and got into other mischief. Fortunately, in most cases, there were other family members to help out and take some of the load off from the widow. (It is certainly no better today!)

Divorce in the 1950s was quite different than today. First of all there were very few of them. The vast majority of children lived at home with both of their real parents. So, while today, over 80% of the children are without one of their parents at home, the reverse was true in the 1950s.

Think about it. Would you prefer to drive on a road system that was really safe, and prevented the vast majority of accidents, or one on which 80% of the drivers had accidents but was arguably a little better at taking care of injured drivers? Our society is crushing our children with out divorce rate.

In the 1950s the courts wanted to know who broke up the marriage, because the offending party would be forced to make great concessions to the offended party. If a man cheated on his wife or left her, he would be stuck with big child support payments and lose a big portion of the joint property to his wife. If the wife was cheating on her husband, she could lose custody to the kids and most of her claim to property. Divorce was far less common. There was pain attached to breaking up your marriage, as their should be!

5. There was domestic abuse in the 1950s, but far less of it than today, because most men were taught that beating up a woman was a unacceptable thing to do. Today boys grow up being told that girls can do anything that boys can do. "Anything" includes being able to defend yourself. Women cannot defend themselves (along with a host of other things) as well as men can. But feminism promotes the lie that they can. To hit a defenseless woman is a disgusting thing to do. Most men of the 1950s believed that. But there is no such thing as a defenseless woman to the man who has been through the feminist brainwashing mill. Hey, women can be policemen, and soldiers. That means women are required to put up their dukes and fight like a man.

The feminist points of dogma, have repercussions. When you say that women are equal to men, that means they have

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

no special rights, or considerations. They are exactly the same as men, and can expect no favors or special treatment. Men who actually believe that nonsense are far more likely to beat up a woman than those who, like myself, feel that women are not equal with men, but are special, wonderful creatures that deserved to be treated completely differently than men are.

The 1950s were not perfect. They had many of the same problems that we have today. People are imperfect, and any society that is built by humans will be imperfect. If we were wise, we would weigh the two societies, the one of the 1950s, and the one of the 2000s, against each other. If we did that we would find that the 1950s were head and shoulders above what we have now. Forty years of dropping academic achievement, has had a drastic impact upon our society. Forty years of an increasing divorce rate, leaving over 80% of children half orphaned, also has had a drastic impact upon our society. But in order to satisfy the whims and desires of the small number of lesbians, and other ill adjusted women, we have sacrificed more than 4 out of 5 children to the god of feminism, and we have created schools that have no connection whatsoever to excellence. That is what we should be focused on, not the small and insignificant number of lesbians who are unhappy with their lot in life among normal people.

No system is going to cover all circumstances equally well. What a society has to do is to cover the largest majority very well and try to be as easy on the rest as possible. The feminist dominated system today is doing the exact opposite! Our system is very easy on the small minority, while destroying the majority. That is a very destructive way to run a country. What we are doing to our children is criminal. What we are doing to the families of this nation is unforgivable. Feminism is pulling this country down and it is pretty shallow, and even dishonest, reasoning trying to justify feminism by using as supportive arguments the evils of lesbianism, women who refuse to marry, divorce, widowhood, single motherhood, and domestic abuse. With the one possible exception of widows, every one of those categories has been enlarged by feminism. (Even lesbianism is being promoted today as "safe sex" by some feminists!) This reasoning is like shooting both of your parents and crying to the jury, begging for mercy because you are an orphan. Feminism made these social ills, not only worse, but much worse.

-Al-

COLLECTED EMAILS 1997-2000

Name: NOYB

Website:

Referred by: Just Surfed On In

From:

Time: 2000-08-08 15:47:00

Comments: I am an 18-year-old girl, and the vast majority of girls my age(myself included) do not agree with your opinions at all. I was not brainwashed by feminists, in fact, my mom was a homemaker. You talk about how women aren't as strong as men. So what? You are probably middle-aged, so I bet that I am more physically fit than you are. I run everyday for five miles, and I have also ran in marathons(some of which I ran for more than twenty miles). I would like to know, do YOU even exercise? Anyway, I don't plan on ever having children, I have zero patience. I have a nephew, and he really made me change my mind about having kids. Nor do I find cleaning a house to be very fun. Maybe most women can be good homemakers, but not me. Why should I be a homemaker when I can do something which I consider more useful with my life? It is not the feminists who are the problem, it's YOU that's the problem!²⁹⁶

It is always refreshing to get a visit from a product of the USA's efficient system of brainwashing: the joint venture of the public schools and our Leftist controlled media. They have done such a good job in your case that you don't even think it happened.

1. You are only 18 years old, but you think you have all the answers. And since the other adolescents you hang out with agree with you, you figure your answers are beyond question. When you are 10 years older you will realize how little you knew when you were 18 and I guarantee that you will no longer care whether or not 18-year-old kids agree with your point of view. Why? Because at 18 your brain has only barely reached a nearly mature state, and still has development to go through before it is fully mature. Your life's experiences have been phony, in that they have been controlled and free from the responsibilities you will have to take on as an adult. You go to school, play sports and think that is real life. It give you an ego-centric view of the world. All that matters to you is yourself and your wants. Once you have lived on your own and been responsible for taking care of yourself for a few years, and done something productive with your life, you will then realize how little you really understand about the world at 18.

2. You don't tell us what you think of your mother directly, but from your comments you must not think much of her, and how she spent her life. That should tell you something about the influences you have been exposed to. You cast off your mother's role in your life, as being insignificant and something that is not at all worthy of emulation. Either you view her as a very bad mother, or you have been taught to think of all homemakers as useless, and not to be copied in your own life. If it is the latter, you are being quite dishonest in your claim that that you have not been exposed to propaganda that has influenced your thinking on this matter. If it is the former, you have my sympathy.

3. You admit that men are stronger than women, but you are not thinking clearly when you ask, "So what?" Men are stronger physically, and are mentally driven to compete, and to win far more than women. It is the reason that men have dominated all societies that have ever existed, and why they always will. If men all at once decided to make all women slaves, there is nothing that women could do about it. From this simple fact, it follows that it is in all women's best interest to make sure that each generation of boys growing up is taught to respect women and to treat them with honor, never hitting them. It is critical that women have a role in society that gives them status and that utilizes their natural abilities. At the same time it is critical that men have their natural abilities and tendencies directed towards positive activities. Men can best have their natures fulfilled through working to support a family. They will direct their aggression towards competing in the workplace, and they will have their need to lead, supplied by heading up a family. They will be taught from birth by their mothers, that women are not the same as men and must be treated differently. Women, who are naturally more nurturing, best have their natures and abilities served by being the great wives and mothers that they are capable of being. They will manage the house, monitor the children and be the single most important influence in their children's young lives.

4. I saw an article in a magazine a while back where an 85 year old lady ran marathons, running the entire 26 miles. Since you don't run the whole 26 miles, does that mean that she is more powerful than you are? While many women can run, have you noticed that the winner of all mixed marathons is always EASILY a man? Although I am much older than you are, I would be happy to take you out on a racquetball court and show you how it is done, or on a basketball court, in a boxing ring, or in a karate match. I would have no doubt about how it would turn out if I were locked into a room with you, if only one of us could come out of it alive. That is what I am talking

about when I speak of men being stronger than women. What makes life good for women, is having men that will let life be good for women. Feminism creates men who don't care about women. Feminism creates an animosity between the sexes that is removing the framework from our society, a society that had made life better for women than it had ever been for the entire history of mankind. More women are being beaten and raped today than ever before in American history, and that is only going to get worse because of feminism and other Leftist causes.

5. It was nice of you to admit the possibility that my page is completely accurate in its assertion that most women can be good homemakers. I never said that ALL women can be good homemakers, any more than I said all men can be good husbands. If you can't do the job, then fine don't do it. If you noticed, nowhere on the page do I suggest that the government should force all women to be homemakers. What I want is for the government to get out of the picture altogether on the issue of working women, and let the society decide for itself what it wants!

6. I am sure that in your mind I am a problem. I do not bend with the times, or go with the latest fad. I do not accept the propaganda that is put out by the media and the controlled school system. Instead I think for myself and that is always a problem for those who are following the crowd. So, if you define "the problem" as something that sticks in your craw and makes you uncomfortable because your belief system is shaken, then I am "the problem" and proud to be so. If, on the other hand, you define "the problem" as the destruction of our families, and therefore our society, then I am certainly not "the problem." Those who thought like me were responsible for creating this society in the first place! They are the ones who made life so easy that it was actually possible for people like you to assume that you have no responsibilities to anyone but yourself. Instead of thanking them for what they did, and trying to emulate what they did, so the next generation can have the same great way of life that you have had, you call them "the problem" and are perfectly happy to destroy this society in order to pursue your own selfish interests. That would sound like you, along with the feminists who brainwashed you, are the real problem, doesn't it?

There is still hope for you. Perhaps one day you will grow and realize how important your mother really was in your life. It is just possible that you will see that there are other things than yourself to be concerned with in life, and you may one day find yourself being a

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

good wife and mother. Stranger things have happened. I at least have that hope for you.*

-Al-

* Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>

Notes

¹ Alpin MacLaren, "The Case against Feminism," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, n.d. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/book.html>> [Accessed July 6, 2019]

² Alpin MacLaren, "Why My Logo," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, n.d. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/logo.html>> [Accessed July 6, 2019]

³ Alpin MacLaren, "The axioms of life subscribed to by the Chauvinist Corner," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, n.d. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/axioms.html>> [Accessed July 6, 2019]

⁴ Alpin MacLaren, "Fairness and the Feminist," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, July 1997. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/fairness.html>>

⁵ Alpin MacLaren, "Feminism and Divorce," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, July 1997. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/page7.html>>

⁶ Alpin MacLaren, "Are Women Sex Objects?" *The Chauvinist's Corner*, July 1997. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/objects.html>>

⁷ Alpin MacLaren, "Female 'Defenders of the Country' can't even defend themselves," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, July 1997. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/page4.html>>

⁸ Alpin MacLaren, "A Woman's Place," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 4 July 1997. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/w_place.html#place>

⁹ Alpin MacLaren, "Steffi Graf Defeats Andre Agassi for World Title," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 31 July 1997. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/page5.html>>

¹⁰ Alpin MacLaren, "Sticks and Stones," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 31 July 1997. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/page8.html>>

¹¹ Alpin MacLaren, "The Myth of the Two income Family," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, August 1997. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/page3.html>>

¹² Alpin MacLaren, "Women, the Foundation of Civilization," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 7 August 1997. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/foundation.html>>

¹³ Alpin MacLaren, "The Fragile Female," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 18 August 1997. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/fragile.html>>

¹⁴ Alpin MacLaren, "The Equality of the Sexes," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 20 August 1997. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/page2.html>>

¹⁵ Alpin MacLaren, "The Odd Ball Game," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 23 August 1997. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/ballgame.html>>

¹⁶ Alpin MacLaren, "Theater of the Absurd," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 24 August 1997. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/absurd.html>>

¹⁷ Alpin MacLaren, "The Tepid Center," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 25 August 1997. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/tepid.html>>

¹⁸ Alpin MacLaren, "The Christian Feminist an Oxymoron," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, September 1997. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oxymoron.html>>

¹⁹ Alpin MacLaren, "What Happened in the Garden of Eden," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, n.d. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/Eden.html>> [Accessed July 6, 2019]

²⁰ Alpin MacLaren, "The Bible and the Feminist," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, n.d. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/Paul.html>> [Accessed July 6, 2016]

²¹ Alpin MacLaren, "The Bible and the Male Chauvinist," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, n.d. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/Paul2.html>> [Accessed July 6, 2019]

²² Alpin MacLaren, "The Bible's Definition of the Perfect Woman," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, n.d. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/V_woman.html> [Accessed July 6, 2019]

²³ Alpin MacLaren, "The Bible war Written by Men," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, n.d. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/biblbymn.html>> [Accessed July 6, 2019]

²⁴ Alpin MacLaren, "A Feminist's Response," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, n.d. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/fememail.html>> [Accessed July 6, 2019]

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

²⁵ Alpin MacLaren, "'You Poor Fool,'" *The Chauvinist's Corner*, n.d. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/fool.html>> [Accessed July 6, 2019]

²⁶ Alpin MacLaren, "Feminists and Freedom," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 11 October 1997. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/freedom.html>>

²⁷ Alpin MacLaren, "A Woman's Right to choose," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, November 1997. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/abortion.html>>

²⁸ Alpin MacLaren, "The Joy of Sexism," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 2 November 1997. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/sexism.html>>

²⁹ Alpin MacLaren, "Ladies First," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 6 November 1997. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/ladis1st.html>>

³⁰ Alpin MacLaren, "What Women Want," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 30 November 1997. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/want.html>>

³¹ Alpin MacLaren, "Real men: The Need for Masculinity," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, December 1997. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/realmen.html>>

³² Alpin MacLaren, "Self Delusion and the Feminist," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 10 December 1997. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/delusions.html>>

³³ Alpin MacLaren, "Babes in Film land," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 16 December 1997. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/femtv.html>>

³⁴ Alpin MacLaren, "Feminism a Virtual Reality," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 18 December 1997. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/reality.html>>

³⁵ Alpin MacLaren, "Baseball and Equality," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 26 December 1997. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/baseball.html>>

³⁶ Alpin MacLaren, "Marx and the Feminist," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 3 January 1998. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/femmarx.html>>

³⁷ Alpin MacLaren, "Feminists Can't Pick a Better Time Than Today!" *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 19 January 1998. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/pick.html>>

³⁸ Alpin MacLaren, "The Female Vote," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 30 January 1998. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/banit.html>>

³⁹ "Should Women Have the Right to Vote," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, n.d. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/chad.html>> [Accessed July 6, 2019]

⁴⁰ Alpin MacLaren, "I am Man," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, February 1998. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/iamman.html>>

⁴¹ Alpin MacLaren, "Big Brother is a Feminist," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 17 March 1998. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/thotpol.html>>

⁴² Alpin MacLaren, "Kids Killing Classmates," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 26 March 1998. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/killingkids.html>>

⁴³ Alpin MacLaren, "The Perfect Mother," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 6 April 1998. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/mother.html>>

⁴⁴ Alpin MacLaren, "The Feminist Flowchart," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 7 April 1998. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/flowchrt.html>>

⁴⁵ Alpin MacLaren, "Ode to My Wench," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 6 April 1998. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/wench.html>>

⁴⁶ Alpin MacLaren, "President Clinton has Declared Feminism to be Anti-Children," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 19 April 1998. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/clinton.html>>

⁴⁷ Alpin MacLaren, "Why Boys Don't Count," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 27 April 1998. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/boys.html>>

⁴⁸ Alpin MacLaren, "Sports and the Feminist," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 4 May 1998. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/femsport.html>>

⁴⁹ Alpin MacLaren, "The Real Special Olympics," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 4 May 1998. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/olympics.html>>

⁵⁰ Alpin MacLaren, "The Scarlet Letter," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 5 May 1998. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/scarlet.html>>

NOTES

⁵¹ Alpin MacLaren, "The Bottom Line," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 9 May 1998. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/botline.html>>

⁵² Alpin MacLaren, "The Chauvinist Shakespeare," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 13 May 1998. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/shake.html>>

⁵³ Alpin MacLaren, "'I'm Not a Feminist. But...'," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 14 May 1998. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/notfem.html>>

⁵⁴ Alpin MacLaren, "Just Say No!" *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 21 August 1998. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/justsayno.html>>

⁵⁵ Alpin MacLaren, "The Cruelle De Ville of the Feminist Movement," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 22 December 1998. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/cruella.html>>

⁵⁶ Alpin MacLaren, "Feminism: The American Invasion," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 5 June 1998. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/invasion.html>>

⁵⁷ Alpin MacLaren, "A Leftist Reply," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 1 February 2000. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/rant.html>>

⁵⁸ Alpin MacLaren, "The Hidden Factor," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 14 February 2000. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/dumber.html>>

⁵⁹ Alpin MacLaren, "Morality?" *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 26 November 2000. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/morality.html>>

⁶⁰ Alpin MacLaren, "Force and Feminism," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 20 December 2000. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/force.html>>

⁶¹ Alpin MacLaren, "Where Are All the Men?" *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 28 June 2002. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/collegemen.html#postart>>

⁶² Alpin MacLaren, "A Dozen and One Years Later," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 27 October 2010. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/dozenandone.html>>

⁶³ Alpin MacLaren, "Military Madness and Feminism," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 30 June 2016. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/militarymadness.html>>

⁶⁴ Alpin MacLaren, "Women in Chess," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 25 November 2016. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/chess.html>>

⁶⁵ Alpin MacLaren, "Men Going Their Own Way," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 2 June 2017. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/mgtow.html>>

⁶⁶ Alpin MacLaren, "Half Way There," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 4 August 2017. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/halfway.html>>

⁶⁷ Alpin MacLaren, "The Black Pill," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 14 June 2017. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/black_pill.html>

⁶⁸ Alpin MacLaren, "The Myth of Feminist Waves," *The Chauvinist's Corner*, 8 October 2018. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/feministwaves.html>>

⁶⁹ Dot. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 3 October 1997. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>

⁷⁰ Joe Pierre. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 5 October 1997. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>

⁷¹ Larry Petersime. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 5 October 1997. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>

⁷² David K. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 6 October 1997. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>

⁷³ Jennifer. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 6 October 1997. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>

⁷⁴ Yatsu. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 20 October 1997. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>

⁷⁵ Ivan Gonzalez. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 23 October 1997. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>

⁷⁶ Susan. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 4 November 1997. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

- ⁷⁷ Steve. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 5 November 1997. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ⁷⁸ Matthew L. McCarty. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 15 November 1997. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ⁷⁹ Dana. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 30 November 1997. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ⁸⁰ Tom – Golden Stag of life. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 3 December 1997. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ⁸¹ Zorko Luka. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 3 December 1997. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ⁸² Yatsu. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 7 December 1997. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ⁸³ Jolina Crimm. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 10 December 1997. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ⁸⁴ Sasha. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 1 January 1998. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ⁸⁵ Caesar Squitti. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 3 January 1998. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ⁸⁶ John Dreyer. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 12 January 1998. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ⁸⁷ Big John. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 31 January 1998. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ⁸⁸ Muller Du Plessis. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 10 February 1998. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ⁸⁹ Chad Morris. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 12 February 1998. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ⁹⁰ Shianwen. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 23 February 1998. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ⁹¹ Cheng Shian Wen. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 2 March 1998. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ⁹² Maddie. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 19 March 1998. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ⁹³ Juli Lavooui. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 4 April 1998. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ⁹⁴ Kristen. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 8 April 1998. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ⁹⁵ Ana H. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 14 April 1998. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ⁹⁶ Amiable Loafer. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 21 April 1998. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ⁹⁷ Colleen. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 24 April 1998. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ⁹⁸ Linda H. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 10 May 1998. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ⁹⁹ Jenn. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 15 May 1998. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹⁰⁰ Great Spangled Fritillary AKA Lynn Gibson. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 21 May 1998. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹⁰¹ Helaine-Anne Roy. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 29 January 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹⁰² Robin. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 3 February 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>

NOTES

- ¹⁰³ Amit Dawra. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 16 February 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹⁰⁴ Manas Malhorta. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 17 February 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹⁰⁵ Umang Goswami. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 17 February 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹⁰⁶ Asif Khan. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 17 February 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹⁰⁷ Shaun Wright. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 17 February 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹⁰⁸ Vikram Singh. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 27 February 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹⁰⁹ Vikas Mehra. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 27 February 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹¹⁰ Melinda. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 27 February 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹¹¹ Carl Brother. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 27 February 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹¹² Michelle. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 27 February 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹¹³ Dr. (Mrs.) Anita Pratap. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 28 February 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹¹⁴ Radhika. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 28 February 1999.. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹¹⁵ Father Anil Wilson. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 1 March 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹¹⁶ Josh. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 12 March 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹¹⁷ Jai Kumar. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 14 March 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹¹⁸ Feminist. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 18 March 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹¹⁹ Gloria. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 20 April 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹²⁰ Esuku. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 22 April 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹²¹ Trina. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 23 April 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹²² Paul Mc C. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 25 April 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹²³ Iqbal Naem. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 26 April 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹²⁴ Mark. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 27 April 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹²⁵ Ariun Ramphal. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 28 April 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹²⁶ Sam. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 28 April 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹²⁷ Robert Shaw. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 1 May 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹²⁸ Darren Ferr. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 3 May 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

- ¹²⁹ A Veteran's Wife. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 14 May 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹³⁰ Mohammed Ahsen. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 16 May 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹³¹ Pratap Singh. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 17 May 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹³² Mark Butcher. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 17 May 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹³³ Paul Sideways. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 17 May 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹³⁴ Shubojit Mukhopadhyaya. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 22 May 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹³⁵ Melinda. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 22 May 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹³⁶ Vikram Singh. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 27 May 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹³⁷ Jim Wong. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 30 May 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹³⁸ Gavin Larsen. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 1 June 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹³⁹ Lise. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 10 June 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹⁴⁰ Veteran's Wife. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 11 June 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹⁴¹ Naeem Iqbal. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 12 June 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹⁴² Karen. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 27 June 1997. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹⁴³ Paul. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 1 July 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹⁴⁴ Lise. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 3 July 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹⁴⁵ Paul. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 6 July 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹⁴⁶ Feminist. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 9 July 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹⁴⁷ Anupam Singh. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 11 July 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹⁴⁸ Tariq Khan. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 12 July 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹⁴⁹ Michelle. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 15 July 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹⁵⁰ Sam. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 19 July 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹⁵¹ Anupam Singh. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 20 July 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹⁵² Myers Davis. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 21 July 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹⁵³ Veteran's Wife. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 6 August 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹⁵⁴ Tariq Khan. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 8 August 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>

NOTES

- ¹⁵⁵ Nicole. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 13 August 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹⁵⁶ Louis. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 1 September 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹⁵⁷ Tariq Khan. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 12 September 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹⁵⁸ FeministBitch. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 3 October 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹⁵⁹ A Radical Feminist. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 7 October 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹⁶⁰ Tracey Taylor. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 8 October 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook.html>>
- ¹⁶¹ Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook2.html>>
- ¹⁶² Keith. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 9 October 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook2.html>>
- ¹⁶³ Dotti, the Pampered, Loved Wife of the Head Chauvinist. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 9 October 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook2.html>>
- ¹⁶⁴ NOYB. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 13 October 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook2.html>>
- ¹⁶⁵ Eric Weaver. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 18 October 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook2.html>>
- ¹⁶⁶ AC. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 20 October 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook2.html>>
- ¹⁶⁷ Elizabeth York. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 20 October 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook2.html>>
- ¹⁶⁸ Mike and Francesca Williams. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 30 October 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook2.html>>
- ¹⁶⁹ Cathy Dawson. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 1 November 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook2.html>>
- ¹⁷⁰ Jamie. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 7 November 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook2.html>>
- ¹⁷¹ Alicia. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 8 November 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook2.html>>
- ¹⁷² Trina. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 9 November 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook2.html>>
- ¹⁷³ Simp. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 10 November 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook2.html>>
- ¹⁷⁴ R. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 10 November 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook2.html>>
- ¹⁷⁵ Paul. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 11 November 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook2.html>>
- ¹⁷⁶ Esmeralda. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 11 November 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook2.html>>
- ¹⁷⁷ Judy. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 12 November 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook2.html>>
- ¹⁷⁸ David. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 12 November 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook2.html>>
- ¹⁷⁹ Judy (again). [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 12 November 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook2.html>>
- ¹⁸⁰ Marissa. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 19 November 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook2.html>>

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

- ¹⁸¹ Brooke. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 20 November 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook2.html>>
- ¹⁸² Sarah. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 26 November 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook2.html>>
- ¹⁸³ Beth. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 28 November 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook2.html>>
- ¹⁸⁴ None of your business. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 29 November 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook2.html>>
- ¹⁸⁵ Hillari Hunter. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 30 November 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook2.html>>
- ¹⁸⁶ Caveman Al. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 1 December 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ¹⁸⁷ Paul. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 2 December 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ¹⁸⁸ Rhonda. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 5 December 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ¹⁸⁹ Sylvie. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 5 December 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ¹⁹⁰ Shelly. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 9 December 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ¹⁹¹ Lynda. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 10 December 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ¹⁹² Jesse. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 14 December 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ¹⁹³ Elisabeth. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 14 December 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ¹⁹⁴ Observer. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 15 December 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ¹⁹⁵ SEXPLOYTATION. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 16 December 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ¹⁹⁶ Thinker. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 19 December 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ¹⁹⁷ Jim. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 21 December 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ¹⁹⁸ John. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 28 December 1999. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ¹⁹⁹ Feminazi (just kidding). [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 1 January 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²⁰⁰ Dale Summers. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 5 January 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²⁰¹ Lesley. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 6 January 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²⁰² Galloi. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 11 January 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²⁰³ Wendy. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 15 January 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²⁰⁴ Paul. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 16 January 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²⁰⁵ Sam. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 19 January 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²⁰⁶ Paige. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 21 January 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>

NOTES

- ²⁰⁷ Andrea. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 21 January 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁰⁸ Me. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 21 January 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁰⁹ Stephanie. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 24 January 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²¹⁰ Amit. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 24 January 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²¹¹ Bo. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 25 January 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²¹² John Kapitaan. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 25 January 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²¹³ Krysta. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 25 January 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²¹⁴ Veteran's Wife. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 26 January 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²¹⁵ Rick. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 26 January 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²¹⁶ Analyser. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 29 January 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²¹⁷ Ches. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 29 January 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²¹⁸ Love. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 29 January 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²¹⁹ John Singleton. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 29 January 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²²⁰ Katia. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 30 January 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²²¹ Katia. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 30 January 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²²² Sam. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 31 January 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²²³ Dan Frost. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 1 February 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²²⁴ Paul Sineder. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 1 February 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²²⁵ Amit. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 1 February 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²²⁶ Naeem Iqbal. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 3 February 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²²⁷ Chuahaan. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 3 February 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²²⁸ A Male Feminist. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 4 February 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²²⁹ Naeem Iqbal. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 5 February 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²³⁰ Geraldine Shipley. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 8 February 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²³¹ Hayden Scott. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 8 February 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²³² Brent Moritz. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 14 February 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

- ²³³ Tina. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 14 February 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²³⁴ Paul Mc. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 15 February 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²³⁵ Amit. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 15 February 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²³⁶ Vana. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 15 February 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²³⁷ Amit. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 16 February 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²³⁸ Allison Albaugh. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 17 February 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²³⁹ Dominic Tagliaferri. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 23 February 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²⁴⁰ Sam. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 24 February 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²⁴¹ Madchen. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 26 February 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²⁴² Michelle. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 26 February 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²⁴³ Amit. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 28 February 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²⁴⁴ Vana again. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 1 March 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²⁴⁵ Paul. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 3 March 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²⁴⁶ Carolyn Flores. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 5 March 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²⁴⁷ Alli. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 8 March 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²⁴⁸ Veteran's Wife. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 8 March 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²⁴⁹ Mr Hanky. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 15 March 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²⁵⁰ Amit. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 15 March 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²⁵¹ Giselle. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 18 March 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²⁵² Kristina. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 18 March 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²⁵³ Melissa R. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 20 March 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²⁵⁴ Vet's Wife. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 23 March 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²⁵⁵ Love. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 31 March 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²⁵⁶ Sidney. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 31 March 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²⁵⁷ Tremor. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 15 April 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>
- ²⁵⁸ Kara. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 15 April 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <<http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>>

NOTES

- ²⁵⁹ Amit. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 15 April 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁶⁰ Love. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 17 April 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁶¹ Love. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 19 April 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁶² Sue. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 20 April 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁶³ Love. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 23 April 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁶⁴ Moniker. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 9 May 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁶⁵ A "Happy Traditional" Woman. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 10 May 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁶⁶ Alie. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 21 May 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁶⁷ Amit. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 25 May 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁶⁸ Nunya. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 31 May 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁶⁹ Amit. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 31 May 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁷⁰ Khowyei. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 2 June 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁷¹ Phobe. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 2 June 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁷² Paul. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 3 June 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁷³ Sam. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 3 June 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁷⁴ Sue. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 3 June 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁷⁵ Charles Williams. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 4 June 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁷⁶ Lauren. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 4 June 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁷⁷ Alicia. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 5 June 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁷⁸ Irfan. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 5 June 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁷⁹ Anthony. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 5 June 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁸⁰ Gregory Whitman. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 6 June 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁸¹ Guy Ritchie. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 8 June 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁸² Guy Ritchie. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 9 June 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁸³ B.Breaker. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 12 June 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁸⁴ Happy Christian. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 14 June 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>

THE CHAUVINIST'S CORNER 1997-2018

- ²⁸⁵ Sue. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 14 June 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁸⁶ Creep, Rapist, What's the difference? [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 19 June 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁸⁷ Amit. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 20 June 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁸⁸ Shelly. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 5 July 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁸⁹ Mark. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 12 July 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁹⁰ Sam. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 12 July 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁹¹ Sue. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 21 July 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁹² Independent Woman. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 25 July 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁹³ Dosen't Matter. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 3 August 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁹⁴ Pontiff Maximus. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 3 August 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁹⁵ Independent Woman. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 7 August 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>
- ²⁹⁶ NOYB. [No title]. To Alpin MacLaren. 8 August 2000. E-Mail. Available at: <http://love.flawlesslogic.com/corner/oldbook3.html>